ONTARIO

Third Session

of the

Twenty-Third Legislature

of the

Province of Ontario

Toronto, Ontario, February 1, 1951, et seq.

Volume I

Thursday, February 1, 1951

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE, PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, THURSDAY, February 1st, 1951, AT THREE O'CLOCK P.M.

- - - - - -

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, Speaker.

And the House having met.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province then entered the House, and, being seated on the Throne, was pleased to open the Session by the following gracious speech:-

MR. SPEAKER AND MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY:

Your are here today to resume your duties at this third session of the Twenty-third Legislation of the Province of Ontario. I am most happy to extend to each one of you, my gretting, and to express my confidence, that as the elected representatives of the people in this great Province, you will address yourselves to your duties with diligence and judgment.

During the year which has passed since you last assembled in this House our Province has continued to progress, and its industrial potential has expanded and grown in very large measure. Employment of our people is at a very high level. Our confidence in this growth has been vindicated, and indeed I may say, established, on a firm foundation. Donditions have changed greatly in the past year. Much to our regret world events have had effects upon our lives which are of the gravest concern. Our nation has found it necessary to assume most heavy responsibilities toward the preservation of its own security and of that of the free world. Canadian Forces are committed to this task. Many of the members of those Forces claim Ontario as home.

The necessities of these conditions have greatly stimulated the already strong influences toward a dangerous inflation of our economy. They have contributed heavily to the soaring cost of living and cost of government. Already we find that our manpower is becoming increasingly short for the demands being placed progressively upon it. Superimposed upon our high level of employment are urgent and pressing requirements for national defence. Material goods, particularly those required for defence, industrial, and construction purposes, are becoming seriously scarce. In Ontario, we are faced with the essential need of a larger working population and by the same influences, with a grave shortage of the material things required to support them. Very considerable progress has been made in the construction of houses for our people. This progress is now endangered by demands for the materials which would ordinarily go into new homes.

It is of the greatest importance to our people, that the inflationary and other destructive influences of these conditions should be brought under control. The very nature of these influences and of the responsibilities flowing from them is national in scope. My Government of Ontario, by virtue of its nature as a provincial government, is unable to control the economy, even within its territorial boundaries, but the necessity for effective restrictive direction is recognized. The Government of Ontario will do all in its power to restrain and contain the inflationary influences of these troubled and extraordinary times, but in view of the grave need for national intervention, expresses the hope that the Government of Canada will formulate and implement such comprehensive direction of our economic policies as will preserve effectively, the security and sound economy of our great nation, and to this end the co-operation of Ontario is offered willingly.

/

During the past year two Federal-Provincial conferences have been convened and several meetings have been held. I wish to record satisfaction with the co-operation and mutual understanding evident at these conferences. Consideration was given to the relations between the provinces and the Government of Canada in fiscal matters and to the ways and means of providing a universal old age pension. Very considerable progress was made in all matters and in particular the Government of Ontario has agreed to the proposal that the Government of Canada should extend to all persons, without a means test, old age pensions at seventy years of age, and that between the ages of sixty-five and sixty-nine inclusive the Provincial and Federal Governments should extend pensions to needy person. Complementary legislation to that of the Parliament of Canada will be introduced as soon as the Federal legislation is available. My Government is most anxious that these benefits to our senior citizens will become effective without delay and every co-operative effort of the Government will be directed to that end.

The financial position of our municipalities has received the constant attention of my Government. The impact of inflated costs has created difficulties for all governments. Nevertheless the municipal position is strong. The net debt which reached one hundred and thirty-eight dollars per capita in 1932 representing four hundred and forty-six million dollars, stood last year at sixty-four dollars per capita representing two hundred and sixty million dollars. Provincial subsidies since 1944 have arisen from seventeen per cent of the then municipal levy to more than forty-five per cent of the levy last year, while municipal assessment has grown to a total of more than four billion dollars. The largest proportion of the increase in the provincial budget is represented by increased payments to the municipalities. At the Federal-Provincial conference last

Decemberthe impact of heavy Federal taxation on provincial-municipal sources of revenue was stressed and the earliest possible adjustment of tax sources was urged.

It is with apprehension that my Government views of the expressed intention of the Government of Canada to abandon at this time, the contorl of rents. It is hoped that the emergency with which the nation is faced in these unusual days may result in a reconsideration of this intention. In the event that there is no change a measure will be introduced for your consideration which will enable the Government of Ontario, within its limited power, to continue control over rents in these times when shortages are evident on every hand and to lessen hardship for tenants landlords.

The problem of telephone communications, more particularly in rural areas, has been receiving the attention of my of my Ministers. Rural telephones in Ontario, speaking very generally, have not had the opportunity of keeping up with the wide technical developments in the communications field. Within the Province there are three telephone systems operated either by the Government itself or by its agencies. I refer firstly to the trunk line system in Northern Ontario operated by the Ontario Northland Railway, a most efficient and modern operation; secondly to the province-wide coverage provided by the Department of Lands and Forests, both wire and wireless; and thirdly to the private telephone system operated by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario. Legislation will be introduced which is designed to enable the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario on behalf of the Government of Ontario to assist, extend, co-ordinate, consolidate and modernize rural telephone systems, using where possible rural hydro system lines and facilities.

Within the past few years the demands within Ontario for

electric power have increased tremendously. Four great plants have come into operation. Within the last year the Hydro-Electric Power Commission has been able to increase its generating capacity by over six hundred thousand horsepower and the continuation of its program will result in the dependable resources of the Commission exceeding four million horsepower by the end of this coming year. Not the least of the new demands for power has come from the farmers of Ontario. By the end of the coming year over three hundred thousand rural customers representing over one million people in our ruarl population will be receiving the blessings of electric power. Plans for further great expansion will be given to the House.

Susbtantial steps have been taken within the fields of conservation and flood control. During the past year, in co-operation with the Government of Canada and with the municipalities concerned, the construction of the Fanshawe Dam and reservoir on the upper Thames River has been started. This project will require the expenditure of more than four million dollars. Other flood control projects have now been completed, notably at Ingersoll and at Long Branch. Other work in progress includes the diversion project at Brampton, the Luther Marsh dam on the Grand River, and work in the County of Kent. Steps have been taken to co-ordinate our own operations and also discussions are under way to effect a Federal-Provincial-Municipal partnership to deal with this most important matter.

The benefits to Ontario agriculture coming from the betterment of telephone communications, the extension of rural Hydro lines and extensive conservation projects are related closely to the many other services provided for the improvement of the conditions of farm life. Research projects in nutrition, pasture improvement, soil utilization, stock improvement, farm marketing

and many other fields are being carried out. All of these matters are the subject of constant consideration and action by my Government.

While Ontario is able to boast of the most widespread and modern highway system in Canada, the need for highway expansion and modernization is pressing and will continue to be pressing. Not only has motor vehicle registration exceeded the million mark, but our population is increasing daily. Highways must not only withstand increasingly heavy traffic demands, but they must be made as safe for travel as human ingenuity can devise. My Government last year embarked upon a program of expansion and modernization requiring very large capital outlays and in addition upon a program of public works. These programs are of great importance. During last year, at the request of the Federal Government, consideration had to be given to the relative national priorities for construction materials for the purposes of national defence, housing and essential industrial expansion. Accordingly the construction of a number of public works had to be suspended. There is every indication that the material situation this coming year will continue to be most difficult.

The provision of shelter for our people continues to be a matter of concern to my Government. During the year just past great strides were made in home construction, some thirty-six thousand units having been started. This greatly exceeds the previous year. The carry-over of unfinished units rose, however, from twenty-three thousand the previous year to twenty-eight thousand at the end of 1950 which indicates the impact of material shortages, particularly in steel. National direction of these materials to projects of priority is wholly desirable and indeed essential, and sight must not be lost of the relation-

ship between our need for manpower and the provision of homes for that manpower.

In times when the world should be at peace, and when the peoples of the world should be entitled to pursue, unrestrained by threats of war, their normal commercial, agricultural and professional vocations, it is distressing and frustrating to be forced constantly to give consideration to the effects of aggression and to protection from these effects. The conditions under which we are living today make it imperative that we prepare to defend ourselves from enemy force. At the request of the Government of Canada, in whom defence is vested, and from whom direction must come, my Government is engaged in the organization of the means of effective Civil defence. Every co-operation on the part of the Provincial and Municipal Governments is being extended to the Federal Government to create a great volunteer force for the protection of our people.

Mention has been made of the expansion of industrial potential within the Province. Over a half billion of dollars have been invested in new manufacturing plants and equipment in the year 1950. This includes over sixty new industries and has resulted in a requirement of sixy-five thousand new workers. The production of our mines this year exceeds a third of a billion dollars. Over one and a half million persons are now employed in industry in Ontario. It is important and significant to appreciate in these unusual times the responsibility placed on Government, both Municipal and Provincial, for the provision of homes, schools, hospitals, water supply, sanitation needs, fire protection and the many other services rendered necessary by such in increase in the numbers of industrial workers employed within the Province.

It is the belief and conviction of my Government that all men of whatever race, color or creed must be accorded equality in the fundamental rights of the human person, equality in the respect due to man's dignity, equality before the law and equality of right to employment. In consequence of this belief legilation will be introduced which is designed to assure to our people equality of rights to employment.

Of the very greatest of importance to the people of Ontario are our forests, streams and crown lands. My Government is keenly conscious of the highest necessity of sustaining and renewing our forest resources. Absolute adherence to the principle of sustained yield must govern and control the utilization of these natural resources. Steps already taken, place Ontario in the lead in forestry reform in America. In recognition of the fact that the forests of Ontario are managed in trust for the the people of the Province, and advisory committee to the Minister, representative of all interests, has been appointed and will be asked to advise continuously upon the existing and progjected policies of my Government.

Studies are being undertaken which, it is hoped, will effect great improvement in the treatment of mental health within the Province. Emphasis is being placed, progressively, upon the prevention of mental debilitation. Legislation regarding the nursing profession will be submitted for your consideration.

Arising out of Research work conducted in theuse of alcohol, clinical and research branches have been set up under the direction of two of our Ontario Universities, Toronto and Queen's. A Rehabilitation centre for alcoholics has been established by the Department of Reform Institutions which will deal with 700 patients per year. This work will be

integrated with the valuable work being done by the Alcoholism Research Foundation.

It is of interest to note that my Government is giving attention to the improvement of the training of apprentices, particularly in the building trades. It is proposed, among other matters, that a new apprenticeship school be established in an appropriate locality, where training may be given under much more suitable conditions.

In education, conditions are good and are improving. School enrolments rose by twenty-seven thousand; new school accommodation was provided for thirty-six thousand at a cost of over thirty million dollars; the number of untrained teachers dropped to one and one-half per cent of the total staff, and two hundred and eighty-seven more candidates than last year have entered teacher training. School grants reached forty-two and a half million dollars and will be larger during the coming year. Grants are now distributed on a new plan which extends more aid for capital expenditures and avoids the sudden and drastic changes which formerly followed slight variations in assessment, population and school expenditure. General interest in education is widespread and deep-rooted. This is shown in the hundred odd communities active in the closer integration of elementary and secondary education, in the scores of schools experimenting in curriculum revision, in the unprecedented attendance of teachers at summer sessions, in the marked increase of Home and School membership, and in the constructive activity of teachers' federations and trustees' organizations. Our people, dedicated as they are to equality of opportunity, regard with satisfaction, our progress in education, not excelled anywhere.

Among the measures designed for the betterment of the

conditions of our people, and which will be introduced, will be those providing for a revision of The Boiler Inspection Act, amendments to The Workmen's Compensation Act, certain helpful amendments to The Mothers' Allowances Act and The Adoption Act, amendments to T he Racing Commission Act, and amendment to The Public Service Act and amendments to The Highway Improvement Act. Particular mention should be made of The Niagara Parks Act. It is proposed to enlarge the Commission so as to give appropriate representation to the Municipalities within which lie the Niagara Parks. Legislation will be introduced by the several Departments which will all tend to improve and protect the way of life of our people, with the end always in view of giving to the people of our Province of Ontario the very best Government in the democratic tradition.

A survey of the fiscal conditions of the Province will be presented together with the plans for the ensuing year. The Public Accounts for the last complete fiscal year and the estimate for the year 1951-52 will all be placed before you for your consideration.

It gives me particular pleasure once again to express thanks to the Public Service of Ontario. Their loyal efforts and diligent application to their duties assure to the people of the Province the carrying out of your decision and direction. Deep appreciation of long service is extended to those who have earned retirement during the past year and we remember with respect those who have died.

I express the hope and wish that, in the interests of the people of our Province, and in the full appreciation of your service to them, your deliberations and decisions will be guided by Divine Providence.

And after the Speech from the Throne.

- - - - - - - - - - -

MR. SPEAKER: I beg to inform the House, that, to prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy of His Honour's Speech which he read.

CONFIRMATION OF REVISED STATUTES OF ONTARIO.

Hon. DANA PORTER, (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Confirm the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1950", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion approved: First reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Doucett that the speech of the hon. the Lieutenant-Governor to this House, be taken into consideration tomorrow.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST; (Prime Minister): Mr.Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I should like to say how happy we are to have back with us certain hon. members who have been seriously ill, and who were not with us last year. I refer to the hon. member for Eglinton, (Mr. Blackwell), and the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Nault). We are glad to see them in their seats today, and I can assure them, on behalf of all hon. members, that we missed them very greatly during their absences, and we are glad to see them restored to health.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

It is with regret that I note the continued absence of our good friend, the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (hon. Mr. Kelley) who is still seriously indisposed, but I am very glad to be able to report to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House, that his condition shows a good deal of improvement, and we can look forward hopefully to his restoration - at least in good measure - to health.

Mr. Speaker, may I, on the opening day of this session, say how happy we are to see so many visitors present, amongst whom are at least two - and possibly three - Federal Cabinet Ministers, the hon. Mr. Martin, hon. Mr. Gregg, and Mrs. Gregg, and hon. Mr. Lapointe, who are in the city in connection with the Rehabilitation Conference.

And we also have present with us today, a very good friend of many of us, hon. Walter Jones, Prime Minister of Prince Edward Island (hear;hear).

(Page 13 follows)

Mr. Speaker, on this opening day of this Session, when we have so many visitors present, I should like to draw the attention of yourself, hon. members and the public to the work which has been done since last Session in improving the entrance and approaches to this chamber.

Here, in the course of a year, we have thousands of visitors, among whom--I may say with all respect to the distinguished gathering we have here--the most important are thousands of school children who come from all across the province and indeed from other provinces. It is altogether desirable that this building should be so ordered as to give our visitors an impression of the great history of this province.

The work already done consists in a re-arrangement of certain portraits and works of art which have been scattered throughout this building. The artists have, in main, been Ontario ones of great ability and distinction. I believe today we have present Sir Wylie Greer, R.C.A., Mr. Kenneth Keith Forbes, R.C.A. and Mr. John Russell, R.C.A., all well known portrait painters, and Mr. Freeerick Sprostan Challenger, R.C.A. who, among other attainments, is known for his work in murals. We are honoured to have these artists with us today.

The re-arrangement of the pictures out in the entrance to this chamber includes an arrangement of the pictures of the hon. Premiers John Sandfield Macdonald, Sir Oliver Mowat, Edward Blake, Arthur Sturgis Hardy, Sir George Ross, Sir James Whitney, Sir William Hearst, Ernest Drury, George Howard Ferguson, George S. Henry, in order.

I may say that perhaps I have interfered in the order to this extent, that the hon. Edward Blake was the Premier

for a very short time only before going to the Old Country to become a member of the British House of Commons, and it seemed altogether proper that Sir Oliver Mowat, who for twenty-four years was the Premier of this province, should receive the place of honour outside the door.

At the immediate entrance to the Legislature are four great Canadians, who include three of the outstanding Fathers of Confederation. We have on either side of the entrance, beside our gracious King and Queen, John Sandfield Macdonald, the first Premier, and Sir Oliver Mowat, one of the Fathers of Confederation and who for twenty-four years was the Prime Minister and Attorney-General of this province. On either side, facing each other as they did in former days, are the portraits of two great Fathers of Confederation, Sir John A. Macdonald and the hon. George Brown. Throughout their lifetimes they were on the opposite sides of the House but in a time of great emergency, in 1864, these men who had been political opponents met in the centre of the chamber and agreed to engage in discussions, out of which came the visit to Charlottetown--and I am glad we have here today the hon. Prime Minister of that great and illustrious island (Mr. Jones)--and out of which came the Quebec Conference and resolutions upon which Confederation was founded. As Professor Kennedy has said in his work, when they met on the floor of the House and came to their agreement, the Rubicon was crossed.

Among the portraits are two for which we are indebted to the Chateau de Ramezay Museum of Montreal, for the loan of which I sincerely thank the president and directors. These pictures are of two great Canadians, one from Upper Canada, the hon. Robert Baldwin, and the other from Lower Canada, Sir Louis La Fontaine. These men played a great part in the coming of responsible government. Their co-operation made possible the first

municipal act in Upper Canada, a municipal act of which our present Act is a successor. But, above everything else, they showed that it was possible for the two great races in Canada, French and English, to work together in harmony and co-operation. That this could be done was widely doubted in the days of Baldwin and La Fontaine. Today this co-operation and partnership is an accepted fact and is one of the great examples of toleration and understanding that Canada contributes to the world.

It is fitting that these pictures should be hung here. In front of the Quebec legislative building is a statue of Robert Baldwin. It is meet that in Ontario's legislative building should be the picture of Louis La Fontaine. There, however, is another reason. Robert Baldwin was a native of York County. For a number of years he represented a constituency here. In 1841 La Fontaine was defeated in Terrebonne riding, Lower Canada. Baldwin proposed to his constituents that he should vacate his York seat, because he represented two ridings, and that this constituency should give testimony to Anglo-French amity by electing La Fontaine as their representative. In September 1841 the fourth riding of York elected Louis La Fontaine as their representative. In the following year, in 1842, Baldwin himself was defeated. His friend, La Fontaine, desirous also of giving testimony of the new amity, arranged that Baldwin should run in the riding of Rimouski, where he was elected on January 30, 1843. These acts were the beginning of the understanding and co-operation upon which Confederation was built some twenty-five years later.

Above all of these pictures of Canadian statesmen, with their wealth of history and tradition, is the great picture "The Fathers of Confederation" by Frederick Sprostan Challenger, R.C.A., one of Canada's greatest decorative artists, who painted this

picture under a commission from the Department of Education in 1917. This picture is the artist's own interpretation of that very famous scene. It differs from a similar painting of the scene which was destroyed in the great fire at the Ottawa Parliament Buildings in 1919.

This picture is a very fine interpretation of the occasion in 1864 when the Fathers of Confederation met in Quebec and brought forward the resolutions upon which afterwards the British North America Act was based. This scene was the culmination of many things, including the work of Baldwin and La Fontaine many years before, and of Macdonald's genius for the management of men. To those of us who have attended subsequent conferences and know something of the difficulties to be faced and solved, it is a cause of wonderment that so much was achieved by these men of 1864,--truly a great example for those who were to come after.

The work which has been done will be continued in the entrance downstairs, and consideration will be given to the proposals made here last year. Shortly we shall see the opening of the new Archives Building, because of the generosity of one of our great citizens, Dr. Sigmund Samuel, and which is connected with the University of Toronto library. There many of the priceless and almost forgotten records of this province will be made available to students and others in one of the finest archives and reference libraries to be found anywhere.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure those present will be interested in the entrances to this chamber, which constitute only part of the changes which we hope to make, which will emphasize more and more the history and traditions of this great province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make this motion, seconded by the hon. Mr. Doucett, that when this House adjourns the present sitting thereof it stands adjourned until two of the clock tomorrow afternoon, and that the provisions of Rule 2 of the Assembly be suspended so far as they may apply to this motion.

I have not had the opportunity of discussing this with my hon. friends opposite. If they have any objection to it, we will meet at the ordinary time of three o'clock, but, last year I think we found that the two o'clock opening on Friday afternoons was very much more satisfactory.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, there is no objection as far as the hon. members of this group are concerned.

Motion agreed to.

(Page 18 follows)

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all today as gratified as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to note the return to this House of the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Blackwell), and the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Nault), both of whom were greatly missed last year. I know that this year we certainly are looking forward to hearing from the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Blackwell) the same vigorous contributions which he has made in former years.

We regret, also, the continued absence of the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (hon. Mr. Kelly), and we trust to hear better news of him during this session.

I should like to extend our congratulations to the hon. member for Durham (hon. Mr. Foote), and the hon. member for Grey-North (Mr. Phillips), on their elevation to the Cabinet, where I am sure their work will be watched, Mr. Speaker, with great interest by all members of the House, and particularly by the hon. members on this side of the House.

We have met today, Mr. Speaker, in a time of storm. Indeed, if the weather is any guide as to what we may expect in the future, I would be tempted to suggest that we shall have an interesting, if not a stormy session.

I understand that several other Legislatures are being opened today, although I think the Legislature of Prince Edward Island is not one of them, or their Prime Minister would not be here.

In any event, we appreciate and welcome the fact that this year the Legislature of Ontario is being opened somewhat earlier than usual.

I also with to take this opportunity, while the spirit of unanimity is upon us, to commend the Prime Minister upon the re-ordering of the portraits which appear close to this Chamber. I think he has done well and the improvement is very great, for the reasons he has indicated so clearly today.

I would, however, Mr. Speaker, renew my annual plea for the completion of the list. The hon. Prime Minister himself (Mr. Frost) is the sixteenth Prime Minister of Ontario, as I count them, and some of the more recent Prime Ministers have so far eluded his efforts and mine to reduce them to oil (oh; oh).

I once again appeal to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and to the Arts Committee of the House to spare no effort to make certain that they are reduced to oil whilst they are still with us.

I think we could well afford the expenditure, in view of the fact that one Prime Minister held office - as we have been reminded today - for twenty-four years, from the 31st, October, 1872, to the 14th July, 1896, a record which I suspect will stand for quite a long time. (oh, oh).

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to contribute today. Once again we welcome back those who were not with us at the last session, and we hope that their recoveries will mean their very active participation in the work of the House this year. (hear;hear).

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey-South): Mr. Speaker, may I concur with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Forst) and the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) in the remarks they have made this afternoon, in welcoming back to this Chamber the two hon. members who have not been wit us constantly due to illness, and to congratulate, also, the two hon. members who have been appointed to the Cabinet, the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Foote) who I am sure was glad to be relieved from one post and elevated to another, in the administration of the Province.

Also, I wish to congratulate my good friend, the hon. member for Grey-North (Mr. Phillips), who now occupies the portfolio of Health for the province of Ontario. The hon. member for Grey-North (Mr. Phillips) beings to this position, Mr. Speaker, a long and varied experience in the medical field, which should - and I think will fot him for the importance of the task which now is upon him.

As the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has said, we will watch their performances in this Legislature, and in the interest of good government in this province, we will check them from time to time, but today, on this occasion, we feel that their promotions have been justified, until it has been proven otherwise.

Then I would say, Mr. Speaker, that we welcome the hon. Ministers here this afternoon, particularly those in the front row, the Federal Cabinet Ministers who are with us on this occasion and perhaps, also, the hon. Prime Minister from Prince Edward Island, because to those of us in this group think it is a great thing to have a Prime Minister of a particular political persuasion in this Chamber, even if it is only for a day. (Hear, hear). We feel it is a good omen for the days which lie ahead when they will come, not for a day, but come to stay. It may be that the visit of the Prime Minister of Prince Edward Island will start the trend rolling in the right direction.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I should say on this occasion that we meet in the third session of this Legislature in a time of great international trouble. I imagine, as we progress in the debates in the Chamber, that our voices and our arguments will be tempered somewhat by a realization of the gravity of the international situation, but I, for one, do not believe we should seek to curtail arguments in these times. I do not believe we should lessen our attempts to ferret out the best in legislation but rather in these troublesome days, the solemn and great duty of legislatures at this time

is, first, to put our house in order and then to keep it in order, and see to it that the legislation we pass is the best possible legislation, that it meets the needs of the people of the Province in a more realistic way; which will be the great bulwark---the greatest we can erect against outside forces, and will be the greatest contribution we can make toward keeping our house in order and preparing ourselves for the days that lie ahead. (Hear, hear).

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should join with the others in commenting upon the remarks made by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

Since the hon. leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Oliver) to my right, has extended a particular welcome to the Liberal Cabinet Ministers in the front row perhaps it is only proper that I should extend a particular welcome to the artists who are here.

I want, of course, to join with the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the hon. leader of the Liberal group (Mr. Oliver) in welcoming back to the Chamber the very able hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Blackwell) and to express satisfaction that he looks so young and fresh after his serious illness. I may say to the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Blackwell) that the place has not been the same since he left, and we hope it will regain some of the excitement which characterized the years when he sat further along to the right.

Of course, my good friend the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Hault)---who began his legislative career over here with us, but now sits on the other side---

has also been ill, and we are very glad to see him back again.

May I also say how happy we are, with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to realize that the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Kelley) is on the road to recovery.

I was rather surprised that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) had taken no note of a rather important fact, and that is that the Liberal Party in Ontario has a new leader. I would have thought on an occasion like this some reference would be made to the great events of last November, which saw the hon. member for Grey-South (Mr. Oliver) being dismantled (oh, oh), and a new man stepping into his place. May I simply say, Mr. Speaker, that this Liberal Party has been casting off her spouses at quite a rate for a number of years past, and it is almost impossible to count the number who have worn the mantle of leadership. They have not stayed very long. May I, therefore, express the hope that the new leader of the Liberal Party in Ontario will remain constant to the Liberal Party at least until the flannelette stage has been reached (oh, oh).

There is, I may say, some indication that that may be the case because, according to the press a week or so ago, he expects an increase of progeny by some 54 between now and the month of June, so apparently he is planning to stay around for a while.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) under whose personal direction, according to the press, the important work he described earlier this afternoon has been carried on. I got the feeling when I came into the Chamber a few days ago that what has already

been done merely emphasizes the necessity of carrying the work forward along the lines I suggested shortly before the prorogation of last Session.

I feel we have done at least partial justice to the political figures who have walked across the public stage of Ontario in the past seventy or eighty years. But I believe there are other people who have made as great, if not greater contributions to t e Province of Ontario who should be honored, perhaps in other ways. I referred a year ago to Doctor Egerton Ryerson, Sir Frederick Banting, Hon. William Osler, Tom Thomson, Sir Charles Saunders, Stephen Leacock and many others, and I sincerely hope that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will give consideration to that proposal.

Of course, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has indicated two things, one that he is planning to be here for a while and wants to make his home as attractive as possible; the other could be that he is planning on departing, and wants by t is act to establish a beachead for himself on the shores of immortality. (Hear, hear). I do not know which is the case, but in addition to the great credit which has been given to him, may I express the hope that when his day comes to hang--

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: --there will be space left on the wall to accommodate him.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, may I mention that in addition to what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has undertaken, we should not pass over lightly another piece of work which has been carried through in this building under the personal direction of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett). I shall not go into details.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: I will merely express the hope that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) has provided as well for the hon. member of the Legislature of the other sex as he has for the vast majority.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the house.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4.17 of the clock p. m.

- - -

ONTARIO

Third Session
of the
Twenty-Third Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

Toronto, Ontario, February 2, 1951, et seq.

Volume II

Friday, February 2, 1951.

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, FRIDAY, February 2nd, 1951, AT TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

- - -

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, Speaker.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by Committees.

Motions.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have one or two motions here and I may also say that I have a bit of a cold and a disability to my voice that puts me in the position of being one of those handicapped persons I was talking about at a conference which I helped to open yesterday, a Federal Government conference in the King Edward Hotel. I also have a different feeling in being here with this cold, because this House can get along without me bet not without the hon. member on my right (Mr. Doucett) and the hon. member on my left (Mr. Porter), and if I give them this cold the House would have to cease operations. This House can do without me but it cannot do without them.

Mr. Speaker, I have some motions here but if the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) wants them held over until Monday we can do that. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) did speak to me about two

of them.

Moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that, commencing Friday, February 9th, and thereafter on each Friday during the present Session of the Assembly, this House shall meet at two of the clock in the afternoon and that the provisions of Rule No. 2 of the Assembly be suspended so far as they might apply to this motion. That is the usual Friday resolution.

Mr. Speaker, if you look up you will see two clocks. That comes from the fact that we resurrected the old, ancient clock from the cellar where it had been deposited by somebody who had little idea of the history and traditions of this House. That is the old clock that came from Front Street here, I believe, in 1892 or 1893. That clock was here in my frist d ays in this House until somebody with more modern ideas put in an electric clock. For the purpose of this motion that we have introduced here, "two o'clock" shall be by the old clock. I hope it still continues to go, I see the pendulum going.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on our part there is nothing against meeting on Friday. So far as the clock is concerned I am very glad it has been resurrected from the basement. I am beginning to wonder what other forgotten treasures are lying down in the cellar and will be located from time to time. I do hope that the presence of two clocks within our vision, Mr. Speaker, does not indicate lack of confidence in the organization of the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies). The electric clock is dependent upon electricity and the Hydro. The older clock above it is dependent on a more ancient means of locomotion.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have here two other motions. Moved by myself and seconded by Mr. Doucett, that a Select Committee of eleven members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient despatch lists of the members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House, such Committee to be composed as follows: Messrs. Cathcart, Chartrand, Grummett, Hall, Morrow, Murdoch, McEwing, Patrick, Pringle, Stewart and Taylor.

May I just say this, Mr. Speaker, make this motion, but if the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) wants the motion to stand over till Monday we can do that. It would enable him to speak to this motion.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest it be left over. Last year it was dealt with on Monday. There is a matter I want to take up wit the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). However, I do not want to delay it.

MR. FROST: Could the motion go on the order paper, then or shall we let the motion stand.

Motion stands.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have here the motion relating to the stenographic reports on Debates and Speeches. Moved by myself, seconded by the hon. Mr. Doucett, that, during the present Session of the Assembly, provision be made for taking of stenographic reports of debates and speeches and to that end that Mr. Speaker be authorized to employ the necessary stenographers at such rates of compensation as may be agreed

to by him, copies of said stenographic reports to be supplied to the Hon. the Lieutenant-Governor, to Mr. Speaker, to the Clerk of the Assembly, to the Legislative Libary, to each member of the Assembly, to the offices of the leaders of each party represented in the Assembly, to the reference libraries of the Province and the Press Gallery.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I might say that this motion is the same motion as last year and I express the hope that our reports may be better than last year. I think that arrangements have been made o that end to better the situation.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the opposition): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has said, his motion is in the same form as last year. We are given to understand that slightly different arrangements are to be in effect this year and I would certainly hope that the different arrangement will result in a more accurate report. I am sure that many hon. members of the House on all sides were somewhat disturbed last year by the inaccuracy of some parts of the stenographic reports. I think it will be generally agreed that if we are going to have a report it should be a reasonably accurate one. I know there are objections to almost any system of report that can be arranged. That is not the reason I rise today. I rise to point out that we are in t is respect in danger of falling between two stools. We have a stenographic report which is mimeographed and which becomes part of the records of this House for all practical purposes. It is part of the records, it will be referred o no doubt by people in this generation and perhaps by people in other generations

but if we are going to have a report then it seems to me we ought to go further than the necessary expenditure on stenographers and on mimeographing. It would be more logical to revert to the practise which was introduced three or four years ago of printing the rpports.

Now, I want to put forward this matter, not on the basis of any recriminations, I do not wish to be misunderstood in what I have o say today. However, it is necessary to point out that there is no lack of zeal in spending money on printing and publications and other activities of government, with possibly one or two exceptions. But, through every department of the government today and from all the agencies of the government, such as Hydro, we have printed publications, a steady flow of printing. Some of it, I think, is very valuable, some of it I would not think was very valuable. Now, I do not understand the attitude of the hon. members of the Progressive-Conservative Part , for instance, who have been loud in their criticism of the spate of criticism from Ottawa in recent years and who must now be in receipt of another spate of criticism from Queen's Park. I am not saying we should cut off all publications of the government, most of them are well worth while, but I do not understand why we should be so lavish in our expenditure upon material some of which is rather trivial, which issues from government departments in relation to their work throughout the year and yet be so parsimonious when it comes to making a ecord of the proceedings of this House.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Indeed, it might be worthwhile at this point to ascertain exactly how much is spent for all

printing purposes by the government and its agencies in administering the affairs of this province. It must be a very large total because we all know printing costs have gone up a good deal in recen years. It does not indicate, I think, a correct scale of values when tens of th usands of dollars are expended without a great deal of consideration on printing for other purposes and the debates of this House cannot be printed on the ground that we cannot afford to do it.

Now, I am one of those who think the Legislature of this Province is an important institution. It sometimes plays a more important role than at other times, a great deal depends on the work that we here as members do in the House. I would appeal to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) who has shown respect for this institution and an understanding of its importance, I would appeal to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to give this matter some further consideration. I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that everything that is said in this House deserves immortality, I do not want to be misunderstood on that point either but I do think if we and others who come after us are to have a correct understanding of what transpires here, that the proceedings of the House should be reduced to writing and should be in print. For instance, I feel very strongly that the libraries of this Province should have the printed debates of the House. I do not see why that sho ld not be possible and I think the time may come when it will be of value to future citizens of this Province.

I say again, I am not putting forward this matter in a contentious way, I do not want to indulge in any

recriminations. I just think that the government should review the scale of values in which we have a great deal of expenditures for printing issuing from practically all departments and yet no provision for the printing of the debates of this House.

(Take B follows)

MR. J. B. BALSBERG (St. Andrew): I am very glad to hear the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) assure the House that the record of the proceedings of the House will be more correctly reported than they were last year. I think, as the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. aJolliffe) has already stated, that all hon. members feel the same way. There was extreme dissatisfaction with the reporting, the incorrectness of the reporting, and, very frequently, to the inability of hon. members to make corrections.

Now, while I agree fully with the proposal of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) to have the proceedings printed, there is nothing much which can be added to what he has already stated, except to remind this House of a point I made a year ago, that there are banks and other large industrial establishments which spend more on the publication of their Annual Reports than this government is prepared to spend for the records of the proceedings. e are as important as the Bank of Montreal, and Canada Packers, and other such monopolies, and certainly we should publish.

Now, having expressed my full agreement with the proposal for the printing of the proceedings, may I, Mr. Speaker, appeal to ou---because formally Mr. Speaker is responsible I think for the publication---or for the keeping of the records of the proceedings and publishing them if the House so authorizes, and I have no doubt that Mr. Speaker will desire to have the record and its final presentation i as satisfactory a manner as is humanly possible, but I do suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that something must be wrong with the whole method of handling this thing in the House---and I speak very frankly.

I do not know, sir, whether it is a contract job,

so to speak, handed o one person who in turn hires others, and who is eager to have as much profit out of the venture as is possible, or is each person engaged in the recording of proceedings and in their publication, hired on a salary or wage basis? My own thought was it was on a contract basis.

That being so, and human nature being what it is, it stands to reason that the person who has the contract will want to spend as little as possible and employ as few as possible, to do more than is possible for one person, and therefore, have the job done poorly.

It is simply this---whether it is printed or given to us in this monumental fashion---mountainous fashion, I would say, as I am corrected---that it needs a person who has the time to supervise and read corrections and make corrections, and for a minute or two to listen to an hon. member if he suggests a change or an alteration.

I have no personal preference, and I assure you, Mr. Speaker and this House, that there is not one of the staff handling this particular work that I have anything against, but my experience---and I am sure it is the experience of other hon. members---has been that there is too much of a rush; the person who is supposed to read and make corrections is also taking shorthand records, and it seems rather a case of trying to save money and there is no time left for an hon. member when he comes up, when he has a correction, to get two or three minutes, but then to walk out and made o feel you are an unwanted customer and "Maybe we will and maybe we won't."

Mr. Speaker, I assure you that many other hon. members of the House feel the same way. They have expressed

these sentiments to me, and I am sure there is, in a manner of speech, a very wide spread feeling in this House about this matter.

I think it must be corrected, and I would suggest that since we are dealing with this motion at the outset, that the contract system, as such, which was the practise until now, be abolished, and that a person be engaged to be responsible for supervising corrections and publication, and people will be engaged to do the job without over-working themselves, and doing it poorly.

Secondly, if the government should still be economically-minded, to the extent of denying the hon. members of the House the benefit of a printed record, cannot we see that we get it in less bulky fashion. I know, Mr. Speaker, it will be said that each hon. member can make a contribution himself by speaking less---

Hon. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Make the speeches shorter.

MR. SILSBERG: I expected to hear that, but again, things being as they are, and human nature being what it is, you can hardly expect the hon. members to go out of their way to reduce the bulk by saying less than they feel they are obliged to say in the interest of their electors.

But, Mr. Speaker, we receive a mountain of paper, bulky, difficult to handle, no place to put it. You cannot put it in a bookcase, you need an extra attic room, and then you need an elevator to hoist them up.

At least, if we are going to have them mimeographed, and if we are not going to have them published, cannot we have thinner paper. There is paper which takes mimeographing on both sides---thinner; two sides will reduce the bulk by

one half. Must we adhere to the most conservative method of mimeographing. I do not think even the Conservative Government would insist on that---

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Put them underground.

MR. SALBERG: I would not be surprised to see the records buried far underground, because the government will be ashamed to have the public read some of the speeches they have made, and some of the promises they have made, and failed to implement them

I have no desire to see the records either buried or hidden in attics. I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, to the extent that you are formally responsible for this, to see that we start this Session properly. Let us start it by proceedings which will be correct, and that will be handled in a manner which the debates in this House merit.

MR. MARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey-South): Mr. Speaker, last year when this matter was up for discussion, the government expressed the intention of reducing the stature of Hansard, not printing it but giving it to us in mimeographed form. I had the idea last year that the government was committing Hansard to a slow death, that this year we would not have it at all.

In the interval, the government has revived its interest in Hansard, and this year we see it on our desks in a somewhat better form so that, all in all, perhaps we will have a record of what is said in the House.

I want to make this one point, Mr. Speaker, and it has to do with the size of the completed reports. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), if he has looked over last year's debates, will find they are contained---if I

am correctly informed, as I think I am---in eight volumes; almost as large as the report by the Provincial Secretary which is coming in, in a few minutes. Eight volumes is a most voluminous thing, and it is most difficult to find anything in it. It is not in readable form, and surely, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to the trouble and expense of having a record kept of the proceedings of the House committed to paper, surely we can go one step further and have a printed record of the proceedings made available, at least, to the hon. members of the Legislature.

I hesitate to think---indeed, I would not think ---that this government is so economical, all along the line. If I thought they were, and this was the last straw, I perhaps would go along with them, but I am not persuaded they are an economical a government and they might as well be lavish---if lavish they must be---in this connection as in other matters of governmental expenditure.

Seriously, Mr. Speaker, I plead with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to reconsider this matter and give the hon. members of the Legislature at least printed copies of the speeches made in this House.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the hon. members opposite have said. I must admit that with the plea of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) in connection with better reporting, I find myself in agreement. If we are going to have reports, they should be good, and they should be accurate, and we will certainly take into consideration some of the matters which have been

raised in connection with perhaps thinner paper, and the making of the reports less voluminous than they have been, and more accurate.

Mr. Speaker, when my friend, the hon. member for Grey-South (Mr. Oliver) started out, I really thought he was going to support the Government on this proposal.

I really thought from what he started out to say that he had come around to our point of view. Last year we did try to save the embattled taxpayers of this Province a little bit of money.

In view of the new plank in the platform which the Liberal group has adopted, that of "moderate austerity" I thought that they might have come to our point of view, that if, after all, we can save fifteen thousand or twenty thousand dollars, we should do it.

I may say, Mr. Spaker, that I did not see that plank in the printed platform of the proceedings of last November, but it apparently is a plank added since , that of "moderate austerity."

That was the point made last year, and I am sure it did not do any harm to our people. After all, the hon. members got it. The only complaint I received was from the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) of the physical effort necessary to carry these volumes up and putting them in the attic. If these are going to be put into the attic, we might think well of a proposal which was made last year to abolish Hansard altogether.

I would say, however, Mr. Speaker, that we feel that this motion we have made is reasonable and proper, and we will endeavor to improve the record, and will endeavor ourselves, in our own way, to save our taxpayers some money, and I can ass re the hon. members opposite that

we are endeavoring to save money for the taxpayers.

The people who want to spend the money, and who urge us to spend it, are unfortunately the hon. members of the opposition. If the hon. members of the opposition would give us some further assistance, I can assure you it would be of great help to the government of this province.

I remember the days when we were in opposition. We always assisted the government in being economical. We used to criticize expenditures, but now we get very little assistance, and when the time comes to save a little money, they want us to spend more money.

I think this motion is reasonable and logical and I hope we will be able, as was suggested, to have better reports. Supposing last year we had printed 20,000 or 30,000 copies, at great expense, and sent out the inaccurate reports, what would have happened to the "beachhead of immortality," about which the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) spoke yesterday? Nothing we could do would overcome that. All we could hope for would be that the reference libraries who received these copies last year had buried them down in their air raid shelters, where the people of the future could not run across too many copies of them.

I think, however, that what we propose now is reasonable, and we will take into consideration what the hon. members have said about better reporting, and about the type of paper being used.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

HOURS OF WORK AND VACATIONS WITH PAY ACT

MR. ROBERT THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Wismer, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intitled, "An Act to amend the Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act," and that same be now read a first time.

MR. SPEAKER: I am informed by the Clerk of the House that the Bill has not received the usual two-days notice, therefore, it cannot be introduced at this time.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): It can be, with the unanimous consent of the House.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I think we will waive the notice.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): I have no desire whatever to suggest that the rules should not be waived, but on this occasion---

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Is this a veto?

MR. MacLEOD: If the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies) has come to life, there must be something important happening.

Hon. GEORGE H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): Your hearing is not in the right direction. I said nothing.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. MacLEOD: I am very glad, and I hope the Hansard reporter got that remark, because it indicates how thoroughly unfit the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies)---

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I will not accept that, in view of the fact that the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas had not spoken----

MR. MacLEOD: I heard what he said, Mr. Speaker. He made a very personal reference to myself---

MR. SPEAKER: I still insist the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies) did not speak.

MR. MacLEOD: I heard the remark, Mr. Speaker, made by the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies), and it was heard by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), and even the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) was shaken by it.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the time has arrived when we have to make up our minds just what r les we are following in the House.

Now, according to the rules ---

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I would say to the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) that what was said really was not objectionable and there was no personal reflection, and I know that the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) will realize that the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies) would not place the interpretation upon it which the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) has. I have just been assured of this.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that in this House we want to get along well together, and we want to avoid things of a personal nature. I can assure all hon. members of that. I think the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) can overlook the matter and feel that nothing of a personal nature was intended.

MR. MacLEOD: I have no desire to press it. As a matter of fact, I would have ignored it altogether except for the fact that this is the second time the hon. member for Grenville - Dundas (Mr. Challies) has made the same remark.

We had it last year.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES (Minister without Portfolio): I think the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) should accept my word that he attributed to me a statement I did not make. I did say that his hearing was not in the right direction. I made no such remark as was credited to me.

MR. MacLEOD: Well, we will skip it. I really rose to make this point; that I think the time has arrived in this Chamber when we have to make up our minds as to what rules we are following. According to the rules which are given to the hon. members of this House, it is necessary and required that two days notice shall be given ---

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE(Leader of the Opposition): Except by consent.

MR. MacLEOD: Yes, except by unanimous consent.

My own feeling is this; that those of us who are members of the Assembly know what the rules are. I think it would be better if we gave the required two days notice when introducing a Bill, and introduce the Bill when that time has expired.

However, I think since the hon. member for Hamilton Centre (Mr. Thornberry) has introduced his Bill, and no doubt other hon. members propose to follow him in introducing Bills, we might let it go now but that in the future, two days notice must be required before a bill is introduced.

The Opposition did insist last year that the Government give two days notice upon introducing Government legislation, and I think if this is to apply to the Government side of the House, it should equally apply to this side of the House.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I feel that the bill introduced by my friend, the hon. member for Hamilton Centre (Mr. Thornberry) should not be allowed to proceed

today, because there are a number of other bills to be introduced and I cannot see the fairness in taking this one and then "cracking down" on the rest of them. Either we take them all today, or make them all go through the procedure of giving two days notice.

I think we should give the two days notice. It is according to the rules of this House; it is fair to everybody; there is ample time to get them before the House and I think we should stick to the rules as they are written.

MR. JOLLIFFE: May I make this comment, Mr. Speaker, on what has been said here, and make our position clear about it.

I think, in general, the rules ought to be respected that is, at all ordinary times throughout the session, two days notice should be given, and there is no intention on our part to forget that rule. But let us be practical about this thing, Mr. Speaker. Surely we want to make some progress in the first two or three days of the Session, and in order to make some progress during the first two or three days we think it is not objectionable for members of the Government and private members to give first reading to Bills, so that we can get them on the order paper, and that they may be printed, and so on. If that is to be done, it should be done without discrimination and I would not ask the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) or the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) to give consent to the introduction of a Bill such as this and then to refuse to consent to the introduction of Bills by them. That would be most unfair, and there is no thought of it on our part.

Now, it is obviously desirable, I think, that we get first reading of some Government Bills and some other Bills today; otherwise, we will be marking time for a large part of next week, and, like many other hon. members, I think we should

make more progress in the first two weeks and not be under so much pressure, if that be possible, in the last two weeks.

TAKE "C" FOLLOWS.

That is our position, and I can assure hon. members of other groups that we have not the slightest intention of taking any advantage of the rule against them, today or Monday or perhaps even Tuesday. I would suggest that after Tuesday or Wednesday we should require two days notice in all cases.

Now, is that not a reasonable proposition?

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I find myself in agreement with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), and that is why we gladly consented, as far as we were concerned, to the waiver of any notice in connection with my hon. friend the member for Hamilton-Centre's (Mr. Thornberry) Bill.

Here is the situation: here is the order paper with nothing on it. That is the way I like to see it at various times of the year, but the point is that we cannot go ahead here without business. If we introduce Bills here today, they can be printed and, probably, on the order paper. It is very doubtful that we can do very much on Monday afternoon, which really means that for the first two days of the Session following the opening very little can be done because of the necessity of getting printing done.

I think under those circumstances we should introduce as many Bills as we can in order that they may be printed and placed upon the order paper. I think that is particularly true, sir, in connection with government business. If the opposition feels that for some reason or other, as between the various groups, Bills should be held up, of course, that is one thing; but we will gladly consent to the introduction of any Bills which the opposition desires to introduce today

without raising any question about notice.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE RACING COMMISSION ACT

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend The Racing Commission Act", and that the same be now read a first time. Purely routine.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York, West): Is this tidying-up legislation? After one year?

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): I suppose, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) could give the customary assurances that there is nothing about dogs in it?

MR. FROST: No, no. Purely routine.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE COUNTY JUDGES ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by hon. Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The County Judges Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. R. A. McEWING (Wellington, North): Mr. Speaker,----

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York, West): Are we going to have an explanation?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

MR. R. A. McEWING (Wellington, North): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Baxter, that leave be given

to introduce a Bill intituled An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act, and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if you do not mind: I did not want to interrupt the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McEwing), but a number of hon. members did ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) for an explanation of what it is proposed to do to the county judges.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): I did not realize anyone showed any signs of curiosity.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We may be more curious than you think.

MR. PORTER: The Act to amend the County Judges Act merely provides for the appointment of an additional judge in Wentworth County, where the volume of business has increased substantially in the last few years, and applications and requests have been made from that district for an additional county judge.

AN HON. MEMBER: You need one in Windsor, too.

THE DESERTED WIVES AND CHILDREN'S MAINTENANCE ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Deserted Wives and Children's Maintenance Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane, South): I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) would give us a short explanation?

MR. PORTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This Bill revises Section 9 of the Act as it now is, in order to amend in certain respects the procedure to be followed when a person is in default under an order for payment of money made under the Act. The amendment pertains entirely to the tightening up of the procedure in certain respects, and does not alter the principle involved in the Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE JUSTICES OF THE PEACE ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Justices of the Peace Act" and that the same be now read a first time.

Mr. Speaker, I may say in explanation that if it is the pleasure of the House, I will give a short explanation of every Bill without being asked formally in each case.

Under the present Justices of the Peace Act, solicitors are not eligible to be appointed as justices of the peace. That provision has been in the Act for many generations. There are cases where it is considered advisable to appoint solicitors to act in certain places as justices of the peace, and the amendment is to repeal the section pertaining to that.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE LAND TITLES ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Land Titles

Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time there is authority under The Planning Act for municipalities to pass by-laws prohibiting sales of land in areas under subdivision control. It is sometimes difficult to enforce these by-laws and there is no means of preventing registration of the transfer under The Land Titles Act. This amendment will allow The Land Titles Act and The Planning Act to work together. I believe that last year we did amend The Registry Act along these lines, if I remember correctly, and this is an amendment of The Land Titles Act to bring it into line.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE UNCLAIMED ARTICLES ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to amend The Unclaimed Articles Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. L. E. WISMER (Riverdale): Are there 22 sections?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, this Bill amends an act which has been on the statute books providing for cases that arise when articles of clothing and household goods are left deposited for cleaning, pressing and being dealt with in various ways, including repairing and storage. When these articles are unclaimed, provision is made for disposal of them by appropriate advertisement and by observing certain procedures.

The purpose of this amendment is to extend the scope of this Act to include articles of clothing deposited

for dyeing, as well as for cleaning, repairing and for other purposes.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled The Department of Education Act, and that the same be now read a first time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The Hope report?

MR. PORTER Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Minister to require of school employees that they submit periodically to medical examination. At the present time provision is made for the examination of teachers in this respect but not of non-teaching employees. As the various non-teaching employees might have some contagious infection of some kind which might spread to the pupils in the school, this is to extend the powers of examination to the non-teaching as well as to the teaching employees.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE SCHOOL SITES ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled An Act to amend The School Sites Act, and that the same be now read a first time.

The School Sites Act now provides that no school can be built in a township within one hundred yards of orchards, gardens, dwelling houses or pleasure grounds

without the consent of the owner or a certificate of a judge as to the necessity of building the school there.

I may assure the House, Mr. Speaker, that such is our confidence in the integrity of the pupils in the schools today, under our system,---

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: --that we no longer fear that apples, peaches and pears may be stolen, as was considered a possibility one hundred years ago. Therefore, we are proposing to repeal that section.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): That was passed during the Liberal rule.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled An Act to amend The Vocational Education Act, and that the same be now read a first time.

Mr. Speaker, Part 3 of The Vocational Education Act provides for the establishment of vocational school districts in two or more municipalities, upon the application of the boards of education or the high school boards of the municipality. No application has ever been made under this part since its enactment in 1931 and it is now considered to be obsolete, therefore this Bill provides for its repeal.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

ACT TO EXTEND THE RIGHT TO VOTE

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. MacLeod, that leave be given to intro-

duce a Bill intituled An Act to extend the Right to Vote at Municipal Elections to the Classes of Persons that may vote at Elections to the Assembly, and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

HON. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Griesinger, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend The Public Service Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Porter, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend The Municipal Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): I think we had better have an explanation from the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) on this.

MR. DUNBAR: This is quite simple, Mr. Speaker, and something we want to have early in the Session. Under The Industrial Sites Act, municipalities may purchase land for industrial purposes and may then ask permission of the Municipal Board to issue debentures for, say, ten or fifteen years. It might then occur that within six months or a year they might sell that land for less than they paid for it, and they could turn the money into the general fund to reduce the tax rate and thereby make the tax payers believe they were

reducing the tax rate, when really they were borrowing the money over ten years in order to reduce the tax rate.

We want to have some control over the selling price of such land, so that the money would be put in one account and kept for the purpose of retiring those debentures or to pay off any services put on the land.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE DAY NURSERIES ACT

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Scott, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend The Day Nurseries Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York, West): Mr. Speaker, an explanation, please?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, this amendment will permit day nurseries to care for children up to seven years of age. At the present time it is six years of age or else until they enter the first grade of school--after they leave kindergarten to go into the first grade. This extends it from six to seven years.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE ADOPTION ACT

HON. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by hon. Mr. Scott, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend The Adoption Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): What is this about?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to reduce the probation period from two to one year.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE HOURS OF WORK AND VACATIONS WITH PAY ACT

MR. L. F. K. FELL (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Thomas (Ontario), that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Would the hon. member (Mr. Fell) explain, Mr. Speaker?

MR. FELL: The purpose of this Bill is to provide for two weeks vacation with pay, and to clarify some of the present provisions with regard to vacations with pay. It calls basically for two weeks vacation with pay after one year's service; it increases the amount of pay from four per cent -- or, at least, from two per cent to four per cent, and includes the holidays and vacation with pay in the calculation.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE PLANNING ACT

HON. W. GRIESINGER (Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Speaker, moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Welsh, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend The Planning Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

There are four minor amendments, the majority of them asked by the planning boards and also by the solicitors

of different municipalities. There is nothing earth-shaking about it, and fuller explanation will be given on second reading.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE MINING ACT

HON. W. S. GEMMELL (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Welsh, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend The Mining Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane, South): Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) explain about the Bill?

MR. GEMMELL: Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment to make it clear that the staking of a mining claim does not give the staker the right to examine the gravel, the surplus material which may be of some value on the surface.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Salsberg, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled An Act to amend The Municipal Act, and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

ACT RESPECTING FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

MR. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Chartrand, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled An Act Respecting Fair Employment Practices, and that the same be now read a first time.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I say there was an intention expressed in the Speech

from the Throne to legislate on that subject, and I question whether an Bill relating to it is in order. You might take that into consideration, Mr. Speaker; I have not looked it up.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Oh, no.

MR. FROST: I have not looked up May, Bourinot, Lewis or anyone else, but it seems we are going to ridiculous lengths when we start introducing legislation on matters that are contemplated in the Speech from the Throne.

MR. JOLLIFFE: But there is no rule against it.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey, South): It might just turn out, Mr. Speaker, that ours is the better of the two.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: I think we should see it and see what happens then.

MR. FROST: You might take that into consideration, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will be glad to take it into consideration, I can assure you, and I shall give a ruling, all being well, on Monday.

Motion agreed to: First reading of the Bill.

ACT RESPECTING FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

MR. H. WALTERS (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, perhaps you had better take this one into consideration at the same time. I move, seconded by Mr. Wismer, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "The Fair Employment Practices Act, 1951", and that the same be now read a first time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid I must take this into consideration too, having said I would do so in the case of the other.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Kind of got to the gun before you, eh?

MR. SPEAKER: We will put them through first reading, and then I will give a ruling.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE TRAINING SCHOOLS ACT

HON. J. W. FOOTE (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Phillips, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend The Training Schools Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York, East): Will the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) tell us what the Bill contemplates?

MR. FOOTE: Mr. Speaker, the proposal in the Bill is to increase the grants to the Roman Catholic training schools by thirty cents a day. The present rate is $1.50 and the actual, certified costs are $1.80.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

ACT RESPECTING FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

MR. J. B. SALESBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, in view of your statement and in view of the fact I have done this on a number of occasions in the past, I move, seconded by Mr. MacLeod, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting Fair Employment Practices," and that the same be now read a first time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: The only thing I can say to hon. members is that I only hope I find one ruling to cover all three Bills.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (Bellwoods): What about the fourth?

(Page D-1 follows)

MR. A. A. MacLEOD, (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I do not think there was any reference to this in the Speech from the Throne.

ELECTIONS' ACT.

I move, seconded by Mr. Salsberg, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Elections Act" and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; First reading of the Bill.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Calder, that leave given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act" and that he the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to: First reading of the Bill.

MINIMUM WAGE ACT.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by Mr. Salsberg that leave be given to introduce a Boll intituled "An Act to Amend the Minimum Wage Act", and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; First reading of the Bill.

HOURS OF WORK AND VACATIONS WITH PAY ACT.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by Mr. MacLeod, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to Amend the Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act" and that same be now ead a first time.

Motion agreed to; First reading ofthe Bill.

PUBLIC SCHOOL ACT.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Salsberg that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to Amend the Public School Act" and that same be now read

a first time.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Would the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) explain that Bill?

MR. MacLEOD: Yes, you have heard it before. Under the Bill the School Boards of the province would be given the authority to make disbursements to provide milk for school children.

MR. OLIVER: Have you read the Hope report?

MR. MacLEOD: No, I have not even seen it. I do not know whether there is anything in there or not. It is already considered an obsolete document.

Motion agreed to; First reading of the Bill.

HOURS OF WORK AND VACATIONS WITH PAY ACT.

MR. J. D. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. MacLeod, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to Amend the Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act" and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; First reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

hon. G. A. WELLS (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present to the House the Report of the Provincial Auditor for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1950;

The Public Accounts for the province of Ontario for the fiscal year ending on March 31, 1950.

The Fourth Report of the Liquor License Board of Ontario, for the twelve-month fiscal period ending on the 31st of March, 1950.

The report of the Royal Commission appointed under the Public Inquiries Act by Order-in-Council, dated October sixth, 1949, to enquire into and report upon the Workmen's Compensation Act.

The report of a Royal Commission on Education, appointed under

the Public Inquiries' Act by Order-in-Council, dated March twenty-first, 1945.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear;hear.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. A. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Will the hon. provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) permit a question arising out of what he said? The last-named document was, I must say, made available to me shortly after it was reported in the press, but I think other hon. members of the House would be interested to know when it is going to be available to them.

hon. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I believe further mimeographed copies are now available or almost available. I think they may be on hon. members' desks on Monday. The report is in the printers' hands, and the printed copies will be available subject to there being no objection on the part ofthe hon. members of the Liberal opposition as to the printing of that report, as soon as it is received from the printers.

The reports will be available for hon. members in the House within the next day or two.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I might say there are a few mimeographed copies available and if any of the hon. members would let me know, I will try and let them have copies. They will be available on Monday.

Hon. MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I, of course, am sure that the hon. members will all read that report, and especially the hon. leader of the Liberal Party in the House (Mr. Oliver).

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Why me especially?

MR. PORTER: Because I recall so vividly that you said not very long ago that your tongue was hanging out, and you and the people of Ontario were panting - "panting" I think was the

word was for an opportunity of reading it.

MR. OLIVER: You had a day dream; you are calling on your imagination.

MR. PORTER: Well, we will look up the Hansard.

MR. OLIVER: Is it as accurate in that as anything else?

MR. PORTER: And I hope he readsevery word of it -- every word of it.

MR. OLIVER: Every word of it?

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): The hon. minister, (Mr. Porter) should know it is no worse to be with your tongue hanging out, than to speak with your tongue in your cheek.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: That is too subtle for me.

MR. PORTER: It is better to speak with your tongue in your cheek than to speak out of both sides of your mouth at the same time.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Better still to turn the other cheek.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I think we have reached the point where we can adjourn the House. On Monday it is our intention to proceed with Bills insofar as we can. It would appear that Monday may not be a very lengthy session, however, I will not say anything about that, because sometimes when I make that statement, it turns out to be something else. We will proceed with the Throne Speech on Tuesday. The mover and

seconder will speak, and I would like to go ahead with the Leaders' debates on Wednesday, and continue with the Throne debate on Wednesday and Thursday. We can get the two full days in, and then go ahead with Bills next Friday.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3:30 of the clock, p. m.

- - - - - - - - - -

ONTARIO

Third Session
of the
Twenty-Third Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

Toronto, Ontario, February 5, 1951, et seq.

Volume III

Monday, February 5, 1951.

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, MONDAY, February 5th, 1951, AT THREE O'CLOCK P.M.

- - - - -

HON. (Rev.) M.C. DAVIES, Speaker.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

Of the Corporation of Niagara Falls, praying that an Act may pass ratifying an Agreement with the Township of Stamford for the supply of water to the said Township.

Of the Corporation of the Rideau Club, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the Club to borrow money, issue bonds, etc., to a total of $50,000.00.

Of the Corporation of Barclays Trust Company, praying that an Act may pass enabling the Company to carry on business in Ontario as a Trust Company only.

Of the Corporation of Wycliffe College, praying that an Act may pass enlarging the powers of the Corporation in of degrees in theology.

Of the Corporation of the Jewish Congregation of Anshe-Sholom of Hamilton, praying that an Act may pass enlarging the powers of the Corporation to hold land and increasing the number of officers of the said Corporation.

Of the Corporation of the Town of Preston, praying that

an Act may pass withdrawing the Town from the County of Waterloo for municipal purposes.

Of the Corporation of the United Church of Canada, praying that an Act may pass enlarging the powers of investments by the said Corporation.

Of the General Trust of Canada, of the City of Montreal, praying that an Act may pass permitting it to be registered under the provisions of The Trust and Loan Corporations Act, for the purpose of enabling it to transact only the business of a Trust Company in Ontario.

Of the Corporation of the City of Sarnia, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the appointment of a City Manager.

Of the Corporation of the City of St. Thomas, praying that an Act may pass annexing part of the Township of Yarmouth to the said City and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the Township of Moore, praying that an Act may pass permitting the said Corporation to grant a fixed assessment on the properties of the Canadian Oil Refineries Limited.

Of the Corporation of the City of Woodstock, praying that an Act may pass confirming an Order made by the Municipal Board on the 8th day of February, 1950, annexing part of the Township of East Oxford to the City of Woodstock.

Of the Corporation of the City of Fort William, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the appointment of a Board of Governors for the Fort William Gardens.

Of the Corporation of the City of London, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the formation of The London Transportation Commission and for other purposes.

Of A.S. Hodge, E. McMurray, et. al., praying that an Act may pass incorporating the Young Men's Christian Association of Greater Niagara.

Of the Corporation of the Jewish Community Centre of Toronto, praying that an Act may pass exempting the lands, etc., of the Corporation from municipal taxation except for local improvements.

of Frank O'Brien, Norman N. Byrne, et. al., praying that an Act may pass incorporating the Hamilton Foundation.

Of the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Ontario and the Rector of St. Thomas Church, Belleville, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the sale of certain lands to the Bell Telephone Company.

Of the Corporation of the City of Hamilton, praying that an Act may pass empowering the Corporation to pass by-laws for smoke-control and for other purposes.

Of the Windsor Public Utilities Commission, praying that an Act may pass empowering the Commission to enlarge its pension plan.

Of Thomas Frederick Rawson, praying that an Act may pass ratifying a by-law of the City of Belleville granting the petitioner a bus franchise in the said City.

Of the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass amending The Synod of the Diocese of Ottawa Act, 1936, so that the income from the Trust Fund thereby established shall be used for the benefit of the Bishop of the said Diocese.

Of the Corporation of the Township of East York, praying that an Act may pass increasing the number of members of the Council and prohibiting annexation of the said Township

Of Mr. Hodge, M. Industry, Mr. Ely, praying that he may act and pass incorporating the Young Men's Christian Association of Greater Illinois.

Of the Committee of the English Community Church of Chicago, praying that we may pass excluding the Lodge, Society of the Congregation from multiple tenancy except for legal improvements.

Of Frank Chapman, Robert E. Burke, Mr. Ely, praying that we may pass incorporating the Chicago Commercial Club.

Of the Investment Owner of the Commerce of Medicine and the Lawyer of Mr. Thomas Chapman, Andrew Ely, praying that we may pass authorizing the Sale of Western Lands to the Gulf Transmission Company.

Of the Corporation of the City of Evanston, praying that we may pass requiring the Corporation to make by-laws for smoke-control and for street purposes.

Of the Cookery and Life Insurance Committee, praying that we may pass requiring the Commission to approve his question plan.

Of Mr. Hopkins, Chicago, praying that we may pass a bill : Repeal of the Act of Confederation prohibiting the publication of the Revolution in the year 1861.

Of the Homeopathic School of Medicine of Chicago, praying that we may pass requiring the Board of the Medical College of Chicago, 1868, to take the Homeo Medical College Medical School, and the Medical College of the Medical School.

Of the Superintendent of the Commonwealth of Illinois, praying that we may pass Incorporating the Medical College of Illinois and the Medical College of the Medical School.

for a period of five years without the consent of the electors.

Of the Corporation of the City of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass confirming certain Orders of the Ontario Municipal Board and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the Town of Hespeler, praying that an Act may pass withdrawing the Town from the County of Waterloo for municipal purposes.

Of the Corporation of the City of Oshawa, praying that an Act may pass confirming an annexation Order of the Ontario Municipal Board and for other purposes.

Of the Corporation of the City of Toronto, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the renewal of an agreement with the Toronto Convention and Tourist Association and for other purposes.

Of the Board of Governors of the Brockville General Hospital, praying that an Act may pass to incorporate the Hospital.

Of the Greater Niagara General Hospital Trust, praying that an Act may pass to incorporate the Greater Niagara General Hospital.

Of the Trustees of the Police Village of Malton, praying that an Act may pass incorporating the Town of Malton.

Of the Corporation of Victoria University, praying that an Act may pass re-enacting its Act of Incorporation with certain amendments and exempting its land from taxation.

Of the Corporation of the Town of Elmira, praying that an Act may pass withdrawing the Town from the County of Waterloo for municipal purposes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Friday afternoon, the motion was introduced in relation to the appointment of the members of the Committee in connection with the committees of the House.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, that Motion was not quite passed, it was reserved until to-day.

MR. FROST: May I say this, Mr. Speaker - - - -

MR. JOLLIFFE: I may say that I was under a misunderstanding or misapprehension about the nature of that particular resolution. There was no desire to impede the passing of that particular resolution, it was the companion resolution I had in mind.

MR. FROST: I might take the companion motion and place it before the House, which will enable the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) to speak on the point that he has in mind. I will make the motion.

Moved by myself and seconded by Mr. Doucette that Select Committees of this House for the present Session be appointed for the following purposes:

1. On privileges and elections.
2. On education.
3. On miscellaneous private Bills.
4. On standing orders.
5. On public accounts.
6. On printing.
7. On municipal law.
8. On legal Bills.

9. On agriculture and colonization.

10. On fish and game.

11. On labour.

12. On mining.

which said Committees shall severally be empowered to examine and enquire into all such matters and things as shall be referred to them by the House and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Mr. Speaker, I may say in connection with that motion that we shall possibly be presenting to the House a further motion in connection with the enlargement of a number of committees. Now, we have there twelve Committees, none of which I think are objectionable, in fact, I think the House would generally agree that these Committees are in the main the traditional Committees of the House and the appointment and constitution of the Committees is desirable as soon as possible in order that we can get ahead with the work.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that personally I have always been a great believer in committees. I believe much more can be accomplished by commiteee work than perhaps we have accomplished in the past. When I was Minister of Mines I arranged to have a Mining Committee set up which I think enables the hon. members of this House toget to the bottom of certain technical mining matters and statutes which would be difficult to explain in this House or would be indeed difficult to explain to a Committee of the Whole in this House. At a Committee there are informalities such as bringing in technical people connected with the departments which, I think, really adds to the source of information available to the hon. members of this House. Therefore I say that I am a great believer

in the committee system.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr.Jolliffe) mentioned this situation to me the other day and no doubt he will want to speak on the point, and I would be very interested in his views. In the past we have had requests for information in connection with Hydro, the Ontario Northland Railway, the Liquor Control Board and other corporations which operate under the Government. These matters have in the ordinary course come up in the Public Accounts Committee. It may be that there should be a separate committee to deal with t with these things, and, personally, I would like to hear the views of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) on that. As it now stands, of course, they can come up in the Public Accounts Committee. Perhaps that is not the best place for these matters to come up, possibly it may be that a committee somewhat after the fashion of the Committee on Agriculture, the Mining Committee or something of that sort could be set up where the general manager or the chariman of any of these boards or corporations could give an explanation to the members of the Committee, and to such hon. members of the House who would like to sit in on these Committee meetings, as all hon. members are privileged to do in connection with all Committees.

Mr. Speaker, I would make this suggestion. We would like to consider all these things. I think the present motion which deals with twelve committees--the old traditional committees---they might just as well be adopted so that they can go ahead with their work at the present time. If necessary, a subsequent motion could be introduced covering some of these other matters.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree with a great deal that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has said with some reservation and qualifications. The first point I would like to make about these committees is that they have been as a rule appointed each year. I think this year's resolution just proposed is in indentically the same form as last year's resolution. Some of them have met but some of them have not. Now, I do not say that it is always necessary for every committee to meet but I do think there are some of them which perhaps should have met ere this and certainly should meet this year. I have in mind, for instance, a Committee such as the one on labour. Now, I know that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in the past has been sympathetic to the idea of having some of these committees meet and the Committee on Mining I believe was an innovation of his time.

However, I did regret to hear him say that there would possibly be another resolution with reference to the other committees because there is this serious difficulty for those of us who feel there should be other committees that what he said today leaves the matter entirely open, so open that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, for us to get the matter before the House.

MR. FROST: A motion could always be made as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) knows. I remember when the Mining Committee was formed it was formed about the middle of the Session. It was set up, in any event, in addition to this motion we have moved today.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, but our past experience is, if the Government decides not to do anything about it, it is very difficult to get the matter before the House again.

It may not be an entirely true analogy and it is a different kind of committee but I know two years ago on the very first day of the Session, on the opening day of the First Session of the Twenty-Third Legislature, I placed on the Order Paper a notice of motion for the appointment of a select committee of the House - not a standing committee; I appreciate the distinction,--but a select committee to enquire into Hydro matters, and that resolution was put forward in good faith, not, as some people might think, exclusively for political reasons, but it was never called, and was never discussed.

Last year, unless my memory fails me, a similar resolution was put on the Order Paper by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and it was never called, so that the matter was never discussed. During the last two or three years, for some years past the Hydro matters have not been heard in committee in this House.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) suggests that matters of that kind can perhaps be discussed in the Public Accounts Committee. Well, I agree that they could be but I am not too happy about the climate or atmosphere of discussions in the Public Accounts Committee. There is a certain tradition attached to the Public Accounts Committee, there is a tradition that its job is to ferret out financial discrepancies or even scandals that can be laid at the door of the Government, and that is not the atmosphere I would like to see in a committee that undertook an enquiry into the Hydro, or Ontario Northland matters. It may well be there are scandals that should be laid at the door of the Government

but that should not be the primary consideration. The important thing is this, that here in the Province of Ontario we have vast enterprises such as Hydro, the Ontario Northland, the Liquor Control Board, transacting business to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars a year and, Mr. Speaker, I think every hon. member in this House knows that there is no adequate scrutiny of the affairs of these great enterprises by the hon. members of this House.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And the authorities have not heretofore existed to make it possible. I know the Hon, Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and many of his colleagues must be listening to what I say with a great deal of sympathy because I know how they would feel if they were in opposition and I think they must feel as hon. members of the Government that it is in the best interest of the Province that there should be greater facilities for the information and for scrutiny of the affairs of these enterprises by this Legislature. After all, as everybody knows, this Legislature as well as the Government must be held accountable by the people of this Province for the failures, if any, of the enterprises or agencies which have been authorized by statutes of the Legislature, passed by the Legislature and as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is well aware, and as I think he has pointed out in his budget speeches, the financing of these enterprises affects the Province of Ontario. It cannot help but do so, it is inevitable.

I think it is a matter for the conscience of the hon. members of this House. Do any of us think that the present situation adequately protects the interests of the people of the Province?

I do not think so. I know that the Hydro itself and some of the other boards and commissions came into existence with the express intention that there should be no political interference or intervention in their administration, and certainly there should be no interference in the internal affairs of any commission or board for strictly political reasons, but to go to the other extreme and divorce them almost entirely from the ken of the Legislature after the legislation has been passed, I think is going much too far. I think to a very great extent responsible government in Ontario is being frustrated by the divorcement which does exist between the Legislature, the representatives of the people and, in particular, the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, the Liquor Control Board, the Liquor License Board and the Ontario Northland Railway Commission.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to refer for a moment to the experience of another province. As I mentioned to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) the other day there has been a great deal of discussion in Saskatchewan as well as in other provinces about the crown corporations especially in that province some years ago. There are a dozen or more of these crown corporations which engage in business and which are to some extent independent but which, as in this Province, affect the credit of the province and are the responsibility of its government.

TAKE "B" FOLLOWS

Some years back, after a certain amount of opposition criticism of the affairs of these Crown corporations, the Government of its own initiative began the practice of setting up at each Session of the Legislature a Special Committee on Crown corporations. I find that, looking up the record, there were two Special committees. There was a committee on Crown corporations and a committee on Radio Broadcasting, which I think had to do with broadcasting some of the proceedings of the House. That committee has met at all the recent sessions of the Ontario Legislature. The practice is for the Executive of the Crown corporations, in their turn, to appear before the committee and give information or answer questions, as the committee may desire. Now, I think that is a practice that we should adopt in Ontario. If the Government of another province could do it without fear of the consequences - and apparently they did - I think the Government here should be willing to do the same thing.

The real difficulty about the statement the Prime Minister has made to-day is that it leaves the whole matter in the air. The Prime Minister is very fair in the making of his statements about these matters but time and again he makes a reassuring statement which somehow goes on the shelf until, or nearly until the end of the Session and no more is heard about it.

We think this matter should be dealt with here and now and I say to the Government that there is no possible legitimate reason why they should fear or oppose the constituting of a committee or committees of this House to inquire into the affairs of agencies which are under the direction of the Government.

I would once again ask the Prime Minister if he is in a position to make a definite answer to-day. I spoke to him about it last Friday because I wanted to give him an opportunity to think it over. It seems to me that we should know where we are

at to-day without any further delay; or, is the Prime Minister not prepared to say any more than he already has? Well, if the Prime Minister is not able - - -

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I would say this, Mr. Speaker, I discussed this matter with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) on Friday and I must say that I amy very sympathetic to the review of the work of our boards by the hon. members of the House. For myself I have always felt that the hon. members of the House are entitled to the fullest information. I sat over on the other side of the House when that little band over there were greatly expanded, and they gave us no information. Was it not Ernest Thompson Seton who said "Having known the torments of thirst I will dig a well where others may drink." I, myself, think with respect to these Crown corporations it is not desirable these matters should always be considered in the spirit of controversy; because, after all, I gather that what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) wants is information. I would say that the Government is very glad indeed to give them information. I think that the operation of these boards and commissions since this Government has come into office has been above reproach. In fact, there is nothing to keep from the people. The more information which can be given to the people the better and the less opportunity there is for the Opposition to go astray. I like always to keep the Opposition on the track as much as possible.

Understand, after my conversation with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) on Friday I did not really have much opportunity to further consider the matter. As I said on Friday I was under a certain amount of disability and it took me about 48 hours to iron that out. I had to stay in. I did not want to give any of my colleagues the cold or influenza.

I would suggest this: there are some other matters in relation to committees to which I wanted to give consideration and I will give the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) my undertaking, that I will consider this matter within the next seven days and if I do not deal with it within seven days he then can bring in a motion and I undertake that I will call it within 48 hours after he puts it on the order paper if it relates to the subject matter of this discussion. I think that is a fair arrangement; and in the meantime in order to show the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) my intent in this matter I would say I would like to have a chat with him about part of the form in which he is considering this particular matter.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, that is much more definite than what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) had previously said; in fact, I might say in all friendliness that it is one of the most definite undertakings I have ever heard from the hon. Prime Minister(Mr. Frost).

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General and Minister of Education): Or, from any Prime Minister.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And I am, therefore, prepared to let the matter stand on the basis that he suggested.

I might just add that when the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) says he like to keep the Opposition on the track we appreciate thos kind words and we reciprocate; we like to keep the Government on the track. We think they would be much more on the track if there was fuller information about the activities of some of the Government departments and agencies

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (B ellwoods): I thought that perhaps my hon. friend from Grey South (Mr. Oliver might want to say a word or two on it but appently he, too, was satisfied with the undertaking given by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost),However, there are

just a couple of things I want to say. Since the Prime Minister is going to give further consideration to representations which were made to him by the Leader of the Opposition - and I may say that representations were made to him, too, by others as well - I thoroughly agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he says that it is absolutely essential these standing committees shall meet at least once during the Session. We have been setting up these committees for the past seven or eight years that I have been in the House and the vast majority of them never met at all. Those of them which have met as a matter of practice have been very fruitful - as, for instance, the Committee on Agriculture which meets regularly every year and at which the Minister of Agriculture appears. It has become an annual event.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Any member of the House can ask that a committee be convened. That is the method always of calling the Public Accounts Committee. That has been the procedure in the past.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): It is not quite that simple, because I can recall many occasions when members of the official Opposition and members of other groups have requested that the Labour Committee meet. Is that not so?

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Oh, Yes, but that was to deal with a specific matter. There is no right to do that.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Excuse me. "Let it meet." That suggestion always met with the most stout-hearted opposition by the Minister of Labour. He, for some strange reason or other, does not want the Labour Committee to meet.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Oh.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Do not wave your hands; that is so. I would like my friends to the right to corroborate that.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): It has not met for seven years.

MR. MacLEOD: I think it should meet this year. In addition, while the Prime Minister is giving consideration to additional committees that should be set up, I would most respectfully urge him to consider a standing committee on Lands and Forests.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Hear, hear.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): This is the most important department of Government in the Province of Ontario. The Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) has in his control the largest single asset of the people of this province and I think it is common knowledge that there is quite a controversy raging in the forest lands of Ontario to-day. As a matter of fact, if I-- and I am sure if the other members of the house-- were to undertake to box the amount of material I have received from various organizations in connection with forest matters during the past couple of years it would make the Hope Report look like the shorter catechism. These are matters which I think could properly be dealt with by a committee. The minister and his officials could tell us whether some of these extraordinary charges which are being made are true. It is better to deal with that at a meeting of a small committee, it seems to me, than to have it discussed in the House here. At least, if the members were better informed about the various departments of Government they would be able to make better contributions to the debates in the House. Is that not true?

Finally, I think among the standing committees there should be a committee on Health and Welfare. At present there is no standing committee on Health and Welfare. It seems to me rather extraordinary that we should have a committee on Game and Fisheries and that we should have a committee on Agriculture, and a number

of committees dealing with other matters and yet have no standing committee with respect to those two departments of Government charged with the responsibility of the health and welfare of the people of this Province. I would most earnestly request the Prime Minister to give very serious consideration to adding these two standing committees to the present list.

Motion agreed to.

MR. JOLLIFFE: May I just add, for the information of the House, so the matter will be clarified, the Arts Committee is not covered by this resolution?

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): That is right. Would the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) like to be on the Arts Committee?

MR. JOLLIFFE: No.

THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT

Hon. C. DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Goodfellow that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act" and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; First reading of the Bill.

(Page C-1 follows)

MR. L. F. K. FELL (Parkdale): Would the hon. Minister kindly explain?

Hon. MR. DALEY: I have been asked for an explanation, Mr. Speaker. In these proposed amendments, Section 1---I do not know whether you had intended that I should make a complete explanation at this time.

MR. G. E. PARK (Dovercourt): May I ask if this is the Rhodes Report, or is it not?

MR. DALEY: This arose out of the Rhodes Report, the waiting period, the maximum compensation, and various other things, including burial allowance.

I think I would prefer, if you permit, that I make a rather complete explanation on second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: May I ask the indulgence of the House to be permitted to present a motion?

Moved by Mr. Frost, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that a Select Committee of eleven members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient despatch lists of the members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House, such Committee to be composed as follows:

Messrs. Cathcart, Chartrand, Grummett, Hall, Morrow, Murdoch, McEwing, Patrick, Pringle, SStewart (Kingston) and Taylor.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY FIRE CHARGE ACT

Hon. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Goodfellow,

that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Railway Fire Charge Act, and that same be now read a first time.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) please explain.

MR. SCOTT: This is to bring the fire charges for the protection of railway land in line with the increased rate we imposed this past year on Crown land having a licence to operate.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Miss MacPhail, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting Equal Pay for Equal Work," and that same be now read for the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE LIQUOR LICENCE ACT

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Temple, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Liquor Licence Act," and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill .

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

Hon. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following:

(1) Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the

year ended March 31, 1950.

(2) 74th Annual Report of the Ontario Agricultural College and Experimental Farm, for the year ended March 31, 1950.

(3) Report of the Ontario Veterinary College for he year ended March 31, 1950.

(4) Report of the Ontario Fruit Terminal Board, Department of Agriculture, Ontario, for the year ended March 31, 1950.

(5) And a report of the Ontario Stockyards Board for the year ended June 30th, 1950.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I rise to enquire respecting an order for return which was passed on the 6th day of April, in the last Session, that there be laid before this House a return showing copies of all permits issued for he week ended December 17, 1949, under the Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act to permit overtime work.

The hon. members will recall that on other occasions such information was made available to hon. members between Sessions.

I wrote to the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) on the 16th of October, as follows:

> "You will remember that on the final day of the last Session of the Legislature, the House passed an order for return of copies of all permits issued for the week ended December 17, 1949, under the Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act to permit overtime

"work.

"Would you please advise me if this information is as yet available?"

I am still waiting for a reply from the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) to my letter of October 16th, and I would ask if he could tell me now when the information will be available.

Hon. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labor): I hope to have that information for this Session. That is not an easy question to answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): 17th Order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 17th Order; second reading of Bill No. 35, "An Act to confirm the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1950," Mr. Porter.

REVISED STATUTES OF ONTARIO, 1950

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 35, "An Act to confirm the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1950."

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is not going to speak on this Bill, I am. Does the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) wish to speak on second reading?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to say about this Bill except that this is the usual Bill that is passed after a revision of the Statutes. The Statutes of Ontario have been revised; generally, they

are revised every ten years. The last one, however, was in 1937, and they have been revised as of theyear 1950, and, according to this Bill, they will come into force for effect as law on the 31st of December, 1950.

I do not think there is anything in the Bill that is unusual. I notice, however, in the Municipal World, the January edition, it has a picture of the Revised Statutes on the cover, and it refers to them as "The Blessed Event; Quints of 1950."

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I think the Commissioners who were entrusted last year, or the year before, with the work of revising the Statutes so that the new consolidation could e issued, have done a very good job. There are one or two changes which I might comment on. One of them is the Statutes are now arranged in alphabetical order rather than by subjects. From my own point of view, that is an improvement, but it brings to mind one feature of our consolidated Statutes which is not very satisfactory. For this, the Commissioners are not responsible. The responsibility is on the Legislature. We could have ordered otherwise.

I think some consideration should be given to a different arrangement the next time the consolidation is undertaken.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have too many Statutes in the Province of Ontario. I do not say that on the basis that I am advocating the repeal of any particular Statute at the moment. I do, however, feel that there are too many Statutes, and there should have been a consolidation within a consolidation in connection with

a good many of the Statutes which appear in the new Revised Statutes.

Some years ago, as I recall, one of the recommendations of the Kennedy Commission was that the Statutes relating to forestry should be consolidated so that we could find our statute law about forestry in one Act, instead of a number.

Last year the Conservation Committee of this House recommended a group of statutes relating to drainage should be consolidated into one Act to facilitate reference and better understanding of the legislation by those who have to use it.

There are other subjects I could mention. I suggest very strongly the next time a consolidation is undertaken an effort should be made well in advance to tie together a good deal of this legislation which, at the present time, is split up into a number of different statutes.

It is all very well for experts in municipal law and certain lawyers in specialized practice to know exactly where to go to find what they want, but for many citizens in this Province---people like municipal clerks and others---for many of them the present arrangement is highly unsatisfactory, and they do not know whether they have all the relevant statutes before them or not.

This is all the more important now that they are arranged in alphabetical order instead of being arranged in groups by reference to various subject matters.

I simply raise this suggestion. I do not imagine for a moment that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) of today will have anything to do with the next revision of the Statutes, but I think the time has arrived when this matter should be seriously considered.

MR. PORTER: Do not be so pessimistic.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am not being pessimistic. I am being realistic about it.

Subject to this qualification, I am in favour of giving the Bill second reading, to put at rest all doubt, if there be any---and I do not think there is---about the validity of the Statute .

I suppose from time to time the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) will be introducing the usual batch of municipal amendments, and he knows as well as I do that they become more kaleidoscopic and more complicated every year in his department, perhaps more than any other, and a consolidation within a consolidation would be a consummation devoutly to be wished for.

I think it would be a good job for him to undertake in his days of retirement.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker , I am glad that the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has spoken a word of praise as to the way this consolidation has been carried out. I am sure that those who have undertaken the work would be very pleased to hear that, and justifiably so.

On the other hand, I would have thought if the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) felt there were too many statutes on the book already, that some of his followers might desist from introducing so many

Bills, but that may be too much to expect. It may be too much to expedt that Statutes could bereduced by not introducing any more. Every Statute that is introduced adds to the bulk of the books, and adds to the various Statutes which have to be put into the consolidation. As a matter of fact, the Bills introduced by the opposition and which have been put into effect, have not increased the bulk of the Statutes to any extent.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) tidying-up legislation in recent years has done far more to add to the number--

MR. PORTER: It goes to show that perfection will not be attained in any one stage, and until we reach perfection, we will continue to improve progressively.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that the Revised Statutes are most welcome to those who have to deal a great deal with them. I presented some thoughts to this House at the last Session, and I would like to mention them again. I believe that the office copies of the various Acts are used a great deal, particularly the Municipal Act, and the companion Act, and I would like to suggest that they be compiled for certain key people across the Province, such as Clerks, and so forth, in loose-leaf form so that the amendments could be inserted into the loose-leaf books.

The Municipal Act seems to be all cluttered up with the various amendments over a period of years.

Another suggestion is in connection with the regula-

tions . I suggest they also be supplied in loose-leaf form. The regulations as they are now are almost impossible for any sensible form of filing. All you can do is to pile up a file of volumes and keep some kind of an index to refer to them.

The regulations published in the Gazette have several Acts on one page, and on the back of the same page there are other regulations, which makes it impossible to even clip them for reference purposes.

If the regulations were published in loose-leaf form, and the regulations which come forward in the Gazette from time to time were published with one regulation on a page, and the back of that particular page left blank, they could be filed in orderly fashion and I know it would be a help to those who use them a great deal.

(Page C-10 follows)

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs) : Mr. Speaker, as the mayor of a town, the hon. member for Port-Arthur (Mr. Robinson) probably knows that the clerks in each municipality of the Province of Ontario are furnished with several copies of all amendments, so that a clerk who is on to his job can easily put those in a folder or cover, and have them to refer to from time to time .

MR. ROBINSON: That is very true, Mr. Speaker, but it would still be more methodical and acceptable if prepared in loose-leaf form.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No 19.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 19th Order, second reading of Bill No. 38, "An Act to amend the County Judges Act", Mr. Porter.

THE COUNTY JUDGES ACT

HON. DANA PORTER: (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 38, "An Act to amend the County Judges Act".

ME. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order; I am not rising to hold this bill; indeed, I am not rising on account of this particular bill at all, but I think we ought to get off to a proper start this year.

This Bill, and all those which follow it on the Order Paper, have been printed and distributed but, as a matter of fact, to the hon. members of this side of the House they

were distributed to day at five minutes to three. That does not enable the hon. members of the House to give proper consideration to a Bill before second reading.

MR. PORTER: I will assure the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) if he feels any of these Bills require further study on them I will not proceed with them this afternoon.

MR. JOLIFFE: But we do not know. That is the trouble.

MR. PORTER: We will not proceed with them this afternoon.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not want to be put into a position as being the man who is always holding up Bills.

MR. PORTER: You are not being put into that position at all.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You are. We see them at five minutes to three and the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) says: "If the Leader of the Opposition objects, we will hoist it". That is not a proper position in which to put the Leader of the Opposition. We do not know until we read the Bills whether consideration should be postponed or not. If the Government is on to its job these Bills would be printed a day in advance so they could be given study by every hon. member of the House, such study as each hon. member ought to give them, and that applies to the hon. members on both sides of the House.

This Bill in regard to the County Judges was explained on first reading and it appears from a cursory glance that there is no reason why it should not receive second reading today, so I am not holding up this Bill, but I do think that we should in the future observe the spirit of the rule as well as the letter, and not be in a position of seeing each afternoon

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

whether we want a Bill postponed or not. They should be printed a day before so we could study them. I am not objecting to this particular Bill, but I may to the others.

MR. PORTER: It is the farthest from my intention, and that of any hon. member of the Government, to ask the Opposition to pass a Bill they have not had the opportunity of reading. They are on the Order Paper, but if they were distributed at too late a time for the Opposition to have the opportunity of reading them, I do not propose to proceed with this or any other Bill, and I would suggest that this order be withdrawn.

Hon. G.H. DOUCETT (Minister of Public Works): I would like to ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) if it is his wish that we leave this Bill? We were going to go ahead with second readings of some minor Bills, but if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) wishes, we will leave them over until another day.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am not in a position to speak for the hon. members of the House on this point. It is not for me to say. As far as I am concerned I think the Bill which the Hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) just moved could go through second reading today, as could the Bill concerning the Justices of the Peace Act.

Apparently my hon. friend did not understand. We are not qualified to know whether we should ask for a postponement of the Bill or not, until we study it.

MR. PORTER: Then we will leave it stand over. We are not objecting to that. We have no intention of asking any

hon. member to consider any Bill he has not had the opportunity of reading. That is the farthest from our thoughts. We will leave them all stand over.

MR. SPEAKER: Do I understand the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) wishes to withdraw his motion?

MR. PORTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion be withdrawn?

Motion agreed to; original motion withdrawn.

Hon. G.H. DOUCETT (Minister of Public Works): I would move, Mr. Speaker, that the House do now adjourn until 3:00 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before we accept that motion may I ask the hon. Minister who is leading the House (Mr. Doucett) why it should be necessary to adjourn at five minutes after four? There is still business on the Order Paper. I know that at previous sessions it has been the practice to adjourn early when there was not any government business to be proceeded with, but there is a notice of motion which has been on the Order Paper since last Thursday, so what excuse have we to adjourn public business at five minutes after four, when there has been a resolution on the Order Paper since last Thursday? Why should it not be called?

If it is not called now, later in the Session we will be given the explanation "There is not time; the pressure of Government business is such that we should waive our claim to have it debated". There it is. It has been on the Order Paper since Thursday. Why should it not be deabted now? I do not thihk it appears well to the public that we should adjourn at five minutes after four when there is unfinished business

on the Order Paper. I would ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucette) who is presently leading the House to reconsider his motion.

MR. DOUCETT : Mr. Speaker, that resolution was only put on the Order Paper today, and I do not think it would be in order to ask the hon. members of this House to debate it at this time.

MR. A.A. MACLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: I have a motion to adjourn, and I think that takes precedence over everything else. However, I will allow the hon. member (Mr. MacLead) just a moment.

MR. MACLEOD: I was going to ask the hon. Minister leading the House (Mr. Doucett) whether he would consider calling one or two of the private member's Bills.

MR. DOUCETT: They are not printed, so they are worse than the others.

MR. MACLEOD: I did not have a chance to look at the book.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege; the hon. Minister leading the House (Mr. Doucett) is not correct in saying this is on the Order Paper for the first time today. It has been in the Votes and Proceedings since Thursday last, and was distributed to the hon. Members last Friday, so the hon. members have had since last Friday - which is three days - to see it. It has been before them, if it does not appear in the Orders of the Day, in any event.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Doucett moves the House do now adjourn. Is it the pleasure of the House that the motion carry?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: calling the Members.

The House divided.

Motion agreed to on division.

AYES: 55

NAYS: 22

The House adjourned at 4:20 of the clock p.m.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

ONTARIO

Third Session
of the
Twenty-Third Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

Toronto, Ontario, February 6, 1951, et seq.

Volume IV

Tuesday, February 6, 1951.

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

Hon- (Rev.) M. C. Davies, Speaker

Volume IV

Tuesday, February 6, 1951

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Friday last I raised an objection to the introduction of three Bills now shown on the Order Paper as Bills 56, 57 and 59, relating to Fair Employment Practises. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that these Bills clearly introduced in anticipation of a policy of the government which was contained in the Speech from the Throne and to which the government through His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor's speech indicated that legislation was to be introduced. It seemed to me that to introduce such Bills was clearly in anticipation of legislation and, therefore, would be out of order. I notice that these Bills were on the Order Paper yesterday, were shown on the Order Paper, and up for second reading and I have felt that under the circumstances, having drawn it to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that I would not proceed with further with objections but wouldwithdraw the objections but would point out to the House that I do not think it is good practise, I do not think it is sound practise. It seems to me that when the government gives its notice through the Speech from the Throne of its intention to introduce legislation that any changes to that legislation should await the introduction and should be by way of amendment to whatever legislation is introduced if the legislation is not agreed upon.

Now, I just draw that to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and I would say that, as far as I am concerned, this matter having proceeded to this point, I am quite prepared not to press the matter but ti withdraw the objection, but with this understanding that when the legislatioh is introduced here I shall, at that time if in its wisdom the House decides to pass the legislation, the Bill which is introduced, why then I shall ask for the discharge of these particular Bills.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, will you permit me one or two comments on what the hom. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost(has said? I appreciate his statementthat he is withdrawing his objection and I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) does himself credit when he refrains from pressing such an objection. Now, the problem he has raised has some substance. It would, on the face of it, seems a little unnecessary for a private member to introduce a Bill relating apparently to the subject matter of which the government has made a commitment in the Speech from the Throne. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) certain difficulties of logic in attempting to apply any rule on the question and I assure he does not intend to tell us there should be any inflexible rule. That is one of the difficulties. From time to time Bills are introduced in this House which do not, by their title, disclose the subject matter of the Bill with any particularity. I have in mind, for instance, amendments to the Municipal Act, amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act, and so on, where the title of the amending Bill gives you no information about the actual subject matter of the Bill. All

you know, all you can know is that it is an amendment to a large, comprehensive and complicated statute. That is one difficulty.

The second difficulty is that the language used in the Speech from the Throne by necessity is always of a general nature and it would be almost impossible to draw the line between that which is specifically referred to in the Speech from the Throne and that which may or may not be specifically referred to in a Bill or some subsequent Bill. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter which should be left to the House after one or the other of the Bills perhaps has been considered. I well remember in the 1944 Session the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) introduced a Bill entitled "The Municipal Health Services Act," and the ink was hardly dry upon his Bill I remember when the then Minister of Health introduced another Bill relating to the same subject matter and bearing exactly the same name. That Bill, of course, was the one which received consideration and which was passed, for what it was worth and went on the statute book where it has slept peacefully ever since. The government is not really under any disadvantave in these matters because I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) knows the government is in a position to see that its own measures receive prior consideration even though it may be a little belated.

That brings me to one little point that is more or less a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and that is in connection with this particular matter. Some very uninformed and rather silly statements were publicly made. I heard on the radio, for instance, a very silly statement to the effect that hon. members

of three parties in the House had tried to get into the Act, with reference to the Fair Employment Practises Act. Now, of course, I suppose we must expect that kind of statement from people who know so little about it. The fact, of course, is that the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) introduced a Fair Employment Practises Bill in this House one year ago and the previous year he introduced on other Bill by a different name which referred to a similar or the same subject matter. In earlier years the hon. member for Cochrane-South (Mr. Grummett) introduced a Civil Rights Bill which had the same intent. We rejoice at the conversion of the government and we always rejoice at the repentance of even one sinner. If anyone is getting into the act in connection with this matter, it is the present government.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. F.R. OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I want to say, too, that I am glad the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has not pressed his objection because if it had been pressed to its ultimate conclusion it would have created in the Legislature a rather awkward situation because the objection raised to these particular Bills could have been just as properly raised to any previous amendments to many other Bills. The amendment to the Highway Traffic Act, for instance, could not have been introduced by the Opposition if the government had forecast that they were going to amend the Highway Traffic Act and so on down through the line. It is, I agree, Mr. Speaker, a little awkward at times when Bills come in such numbers, but after all, I think it could be left to the good judgment of the House

to dispose of them as in their good judgment they see fit.

I was going to say in regard to the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) statement, that these Bills must have been introduced in anticipation of legislation. Now, that can hardly be the case in regard to these Bills because as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has pointed out, both an hon. member of his group and one of our group last year introduced a similar Bill when there was no government legislation or the promise of any on the statute books, I mean on the Speech from the Throne, so it could hardly be said to be in anticipation of government legislation and if one wanted to carry it on still further I do not think there is any guarantee that what the government forecasts in the Speech from the Throne as impending legislation will actually come before the hon. members of the Legislature. There is no guarantee that what they forecast as legislation will actually become legislation. And so, if that were to be the case in this particular instance, then the introduction of these Bills would serve a very useful purpose indeed. I cannot see why, Mr. Speaker, why the end result will not be worth while. We will have before us the government Bill, we will have before us, perhaps, most of the opposition Bills, and out of them all we can carry out one that should do justice to the people of this province in what has been and is today a very important question.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, as one of the hon. members who introduced a Bill referred to, I would like to say that I agree with the sentiments of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), though I cannot quite agree with the ruling that he tries to establish. From

the point of view of the rules of the House I must agree with the opinions expressed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and by the leader of the Liberal group (Mr. Oliver). However, in sentiment I do agree with the hon. Prime Ministtr (Mr. Frost), and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that for the last seven years I had F.E.P.C. Bills before the House during every one of those years, long before any other group or any other Party in this House advanced F.E.P.C. legislation, and on every occasion I pleaded with the government to take over the Bills or improve upon it and introduce it as a government measure.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, what has this to do with the issue?

MR. SALSBERG: The point at issue, Mr. Speaker, was brought to the House by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) himself.

MR. FROST: Oh yes, but it is a point of procedure, Mr. Speaker, this is not the occasion for the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) to make a speech on the broad subject of fair employment practises.

This is a question of procedure as to whether a matter which is mentioned in the Speech from the Throne is anticipated by legislation which was introduced and whether it is in order. It is the principle of that that is involved and I would say again, Mr. Speaker, that I do not feel disposed to press that point for this reason, I do not want to do anything by way of a ruling. I have no idea what your ruling might be, but in any event the government by its majority in the House might impose a certain ruling on the House. Now,

I do not want to restrict the freedom of the hon. members of the Legislature on a technicality.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: But in these Bills I do not think it is good practise and I felt that we might withdraw our objection to it. Now, that matter applies, I think, generally to that question and that practise and I think the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) should confine his remarks to that point.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) had not interrupted I would have been completed by now and I would have expressed the sentiments that are very similar to his. As I started out by saying that on the matter of procedure I cannot agree with him but I do agree with him that having announced the intention of the government to introduce legislation of this sort that we might have waited until the legislation would be brought down. I do not mind saying that as one of the first members who brought this legislation before the House I was prepared to withhold the Bill I had introduced in the past until such time as the government measure would come down. I followed the other parties since they introduced the Bill believing that on matters of procedure I was within my right, as were the other hon. members, and like all other hon. members I would be glad to withdraw the Bill if the government measure will meet the requirements which I sincerely hope it will. It should be a government measure and I hope it will be carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

MR. G.E. PARK (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I move,

seconded by Mr. Thornberry, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Municipal Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Will the hon. member (Mr. Park) explain?

MR. PARK: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to require that every candidate for municipal office publish a sworn statement showing the source of funds used in his election campaign and the purposes for which they were spent.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

(TAKE "B" FOLLOWS)

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I refer to a statement which appeared in to-day's press by the hon. Mr. Winters, the Minister of Resources and Development at Ottawa, relative to housing. I do not very often make a statement before the Orders of the Day so, Mr. Speaker, you may excuse me for this. I have a statement here to which I should like to refer. I have no doubt the hon. members have read the statement in the press, and I am indebted to the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger) for what I think is a complete statement. It is not my intention to read it all, but simply a paragraph or two:

> "The Government - that is, the Government of Canada - is aware of the continuing need for housing accommodation in Canada, but starts at the 1950 rate are beyond the capacity of the house-building industry under present and unprecedented circumstances."

That is the commencement of house building.

> "Building-supply materials, and particularly products of steel, are in short supply, with the result that many builders and owners are unable to complete houses. One of the main problems is to complete houses now under construction, and what the Government wishes most to avoid is the starting of a large number of houses which could not be completed.
>
> "Since September, 1949, additional loans in amount of one-sixth of the basic loan were

being made, provided that the sale price to the home owner was fair and reasonable; but because of rising costs and of the previously announced policy of maintaining January 1st, 1950, lending values, this provision has become increasingly ineffective. It will be recalled that January, 1951, lending values have been maintained in an effort to curb price increases. Effective immediately, therefore, loans under the National Housing Act to home owners will be limited to eighty per cent. of the lending values prevailing in January, 1950. The effect of this action is that the additional one-sixth provision is suspended."

Mr. Speaker, I want to here express my entire disagreement with this proposal and this policy.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I have already expressed my opposition to the Ottawa Government. I am not unmindful that there is a very difficult condition, Mr. Speaker. The Speech from the Throne refers to the fact that there were 23,000 houses remaining uncompleted at the end of 1949 -- that is, as of January 1st, 1950. That, of course, is a very large number of uncompleted units. I will be quite frank in stating that we hoped during the year 1950 that this would be very greatly decreased, and it was with some alarm we found that at the end of the year the number of uncompleted units had risen from

23,000 to 28,000 an increase of 5,000. While it appears that an increase of 5,000 units is not so large relatively, nevertheless, added to the total of 23,000, it is a very formidable number of houses uncompleted.

I recognize that the problem is very largely related, at the present time, to the shortage of steel which enters into house building to a very considerable extent. For myself, I would have thought that steel did not have much to do with housing, but it has a great deal to do with it, nails, eavestroughs, furnaces, piping, bathroom equipment, and all that sort of thing, and, therefore, it is a very important matter.

Cement also is an item in connection with which there could be difficulties. In other supplies apparently we are proceeding on a more even keel. Despite what some people have said, there appears to be lots of lumber in the country, but we have shortages of these other things, with the result, I know, there are difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a retrograde step to increase the down payments. This provision really takes the second mortgage provision, which we have had worked out very successfully in this Province, and which was rolled into the National Housing Act under the agreement of November,1950 and abolishes it and brings it back to the down payment in effect at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I quite agree that something has to be done with the present situation, and of all things to cut that, I think housing should be the last.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST (Prime Minister): If we are to talk about the shortage of labour, and bring men and women into this country to augment our labour force, and then cut down on a matter as important as this, I think is attacking the problem on the wrong end.

I think we should face up to this situation, and introduce a type of controls or priorities which will apply to the absolute essentials of this day.

That is the attitude this Government has taken. I have impressed that on the Government at Ottawa when this matter was first mooted three or four weeks ago, and now when they think it advisable to take this step, I want to voice my opinion.

MR. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Would the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Forst) add a word in relation to one word he used? Would he now comment a little more extensively in connection with the word he just used, namely, the word: "priorities"? Would he give us his opinion concerning priorities under a provincial control, that is, in regard to building done by virtue of licensing by this Province?

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that we have endeavoured to curtail.

May I point out that it was just a year ago now when we were talking about an extensive building program in this Province. We had a plan prepared for the accommodations so urgently needed for our Government purposes, a building across the road.

When the situation began to appear acute last Spring,

we immediately pulled back on this. In fact, we had let the contract and were engaged in the building of a warehouse for the Liquor Control Board, and we immediately cancelled that entirely, and that steel and other materials can be diverted to other uses.

We have done so pretty generally and I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that if the Federal Government ask us to restrict the building, indeed, to restrict public works, we will do it to the possible limit of what we are able to do. We realize it is a very difficult thing to do. We are living now in 1951, and we have only had four normal years in the last eleven. Everything is pressing; the highway problem is pressing; we need more hospitals; we need more public works.

To-day I was engaged in a matter which I think will be of interest to this House in a short time, in relation to hospital building, and the fact of the matter is that in order to meet the situation which the Federal Government assures us is pressing, we have been endeavouring to stream-line our operations in regard to building materials.

That is about the situation, Mr. Speaker. I would say that beyond receiving from the Federal Government an intimation, before, during and after the last Federal-Provincial Conference in relation to the shortage of materials and the difficulties which are existing in that regard, we have not received any specific request to pull back on any particular project.

We have taken all the suggestions from the Government of Canada at face value, and we have endeavoured to pull back

where we might. It is possible we might go even further than we have gone, but, on the other hand, if it is necessary to do those things, I would think it is desirable for the Federal Government to come to us and say: "This is our position; this is what we have to do." and then we will tighten our belts and endeavour to do all we possibly can in this regard.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I hope there will be no shortage of tents in this province.

MR. . F. TEMPLE (High Park): Mr. Speaker, May I ask of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) if he is contemplating cancelling any cocktail bars and taverns in connection with the statement he has just made?

MR. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with the particular matter of housing.

MR. JOLLIFFE: They take the steel and the material and the labour.

Hon. G. A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following report:

1. Report of the Board of Governors of the University of Toronto for the year ending June 20, 1950.
2. 33rd Annual Report of the Civil Service Commission for Ontario for the year ending March 31, 1950.
3. Report of the Commissioner of Agricultural Loans for the year ending March 31, 1950.
4. Annual Report of the Research Council of Ontario for the year ending March 31, 1950.

5. 24th Report of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1950.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): First order.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First order; Consideration of a speech of the hon. Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of this Session.

(TAKE C FOLLOWS)

MR. J. G. WHITE (Kenora): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Villeneuve, (Glengarry), that a humble address be presented to the Hon. the Lieutenant-Governor as follows:

> "To the Honourable Ray Lawson, O.B.E., LL.D., Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Ontario:
>
> "We, His Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has addressed to us."

I am sure that all the members of this House join me in extending our congratulations and felicitations to Her Royal Highness, the Princess Elizabeth and the Duke of Edinburgh on the birth of a daughter, the Princess Alice. This happy event occurring since we last met, has served once again to emphasize the affection and esteem in which we and the other peoples composing the Commonwealth of Nations hold His Majesty and all the members of the Royal Family. The British Crown is the sure link which binds together the various peoples of a great and world-wide democracy into a powerful weapon for the cause of freedom. Here, in this great Province of Ontario, we are mindful of our British heritage. From Britain, we have acquired our broad concept of freedom, along with our system of parliamentary institutions.

This system has stood the test of time. It is a system well designed to voice the will of a free and independent

people. Here, in succeeding days, we shall see it in operation, I hope. However, in our debates that will follow, we may subordinate our partisanship, and that we may sink local and selfish considerations to the point where we may not obscure our view of the threats which overhang not only Canada but the whole democratic world.

It is unfortunate that democracy, having in less than half a century brought two World Wars to a successful conclusion, now has to gird itself once more against the possibility of a third all-out struggle against dictatorship under another name. I do not intend at this time and place to attempt any discussion of an extremely troubled international scene. I shall content myself with saying that I am gratified our enemies are at least coming out into the open. On Sunday, January 29th, last, Tim Buck, the national Communist leader, finally drew aside the veil. Here is a report of the Massey Hall meeting of Mr. Buck's party, appearing in the Toronto Globe and Mail for January 30th, and I quote:

> "Tim Buck, national leader of the Labor-Progressive Party, last night served public notice that the LPP and the Communist Party were one and the same thing, and that the party had no intention of going underground as it did when banned during the last war."

As one of my hon. friends opposite "laughed and cajoled" the audience, according to the same report, out of a collection amounting to $1,500.39, I may, I hope, be forgiven for assuming that he goes along with the expressed sentiments

of his national leader. It will be gratifying, I am sure, to the members of this hon. House, to be able finally to identify the members of the slightly microscopic group representing the Communist body in our councils here. Their camouflage has been wearing thin for some considerable time and I am sure that it is gratifying to most of us to see the remnants of their disguise finally torn away by one no less than their own leader.

I am sure we also rejoice in their determination not to again go underground. In case of emergency it will make that that much easier to find, and I am sure our plans for national defence include facilities for their proper disposition if and when the time arrives.

I am sure the members of all parties regret the prolonged period of ill health which has afflicted our colleague, the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Kelley). The former Minister of Health never spared himself in his long career of public service and I sincerely trust that in the fullness of time he may again be able to join in our proceedings.

May I extend my very warm congratulations to two of my colleagues from this side of the House who have won well-earned promotion since the last session of this Assembly.

I am sure the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Foote) in his new post as Minister of Reform Institutions, will add lustre to an already distinguished career.

I should also like to congratulate the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Phillips) on his promotion to the important post of Minister of Health for Ontario.

Both of the colleagues I have mentioned have served an apprenticeship as private members, and I am sure their experience, their training, their ability and their soun judgment will enable them to serve in their new and responsible posts with honour and distinction.

I know the hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the members of the Council will regret that business reasons made it necessary for the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Hamilton) to relinquish his important portfolio. It is, however, gratifying to know that he will remain as Minister Without Protfolio, so that his proven ability and marked capacity for public service will not be lost to the Administration. His acceptance of a prominent position in the business world is evidence that his energy and ability are known and appreciated in other spheres as in this honourable body.

The year just passed has been one both of heavy responsibility and real accomplishment in the life of this Administration.

An Advisory Committee on Forestry has been appointed. The work of this body is bound to be of the utmost value. Every member of the committee holds an honoured and prominent place in his own special field of endeavour. I am sure the gift of time, ability and broad experience on the part of the Committee members will be of very real assistance in solving problems related to the handling of one of our greatest natural resources.

The thoughtful and painstaking report of the Select Committee on Conservation is proof that the members

of the various parties in this Assembly, working in a common cause, can lay aside their party differences, and accomplish a work of the utmost value to all the people of Ontario.

The hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) has acquired a notable grasp of the workings and the problems of a large and intricate department in the short time he has held his present high office. His sane and realistic approach to the problems related to health, hospitalization and allied matters is one which already has commended itself to our people. Of very special interest are his proposals to take certain logical and concrete steps toward the early detection and cure of mental illness. Anything that can be accomplished in this respect will be of great value, from the humanitarian viewpoint. The monetary aspect is likewise important, for the enlargement of the mental hospital system and also its maintenance are a heavy burden here in Ontario as elsewhere.

The steady progress in the Department of Reform Institutions whereby the accent is placed more on reform and less on punishment, will commend itself as a worthwhile experiment. The gradually increasing use of industrial farms with a diminishing use of county and district gaols has long been overdue. This, as I see it, is particularly beneficial in the cases of young offenders, too many of whom, unfortunately, bring themselves to the attention of our courts.

Our labour laws necessarily, and I think quite properly, tend to be in a fluid state. The work of the Labour Relations Board is proceeding satisfactorily. We have legalized the 48-hour week and have enacted legislation to

ensure paid vacations. Many millions of dollars have been paid out to workers under the stamp credit system which is applicable to workers travelling from one job to another.

Our Workmen's Compensation Act, initiated by a Conservative Government a good many years ago, still stands as a world model. It was recently subjected to a searching review by a distinguished member of the judiciary, and suitable amendments in the light of his report have been submitted to this Assembly.

I should like to say a word of congratulation to the hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) for the leadership he is giving, not alone to his party, not alone to the Government he heads, but indeed to all of our people. His success as the head of this Administration is by no means the outcome of chance. He served an apprenticeship as a private member of His Majesty's Opposition in this Assembly. He achieved a distinguished record as Provincial Treasurer and as Minister of Mines for Ontario. His promotion, achieved by the democratic process, was a logical one that has been more than justified by his records in his present high office.

In thie difficult and complex field of Dominion-Provincial relations, I suggest that the hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has accomplished an outstanding job. I quote from the Toronto Daily Star of September 15th, last, in a news story relating to the constitutional conference at Quebec City:

> "There was also agreement that Premier Frost of Ontario is proving a tremendous asset to the

conference."

This great metropolitan newspaper has not always supported us but more than once has been able to make a kindly reference to the Premier. His knowledge of his job, of the affairs of this great province, is exceeded only by his his courtesy of which we have such first-hand awareness in this Assembly.

The Department of Highways and the Department of Public Works have accomplished great things in their respective spheres. I shall refer later in a little detail to some of the things they have done for Northern Ontario.

In the Department of Agriculture there is also a growing awareness of our problems in the North. Of especial benefit are a huge drainage programme, latterly placed in charge of the Public Works Department, and also substantial aid to settlers in clearing and breaking land, drilling wells and so on.

Up at the head of the lakes a new mental hospital is rapidly coming into being. This project was commenced, as I recall it, along about 1936, when our friends opposite held the reins of power. They constructed an administration building; they then wearied in well-doing and forgot to build the hospital. This is not the only occasion of the same type. Up in the North we have excellent general hospital facilities but in cases of mental illness most cases have to be sent to hospitals in the South, many hundreds of miles from home and friends. I am glad that at long last we are going to have the benefits of something approaching local hospitalization, and I hope that presently we may see a

further extension of mental hospital facilities to serve other northern areas.

One problem which is always before us in the North relates to the handling of our great forest resources. It is no accident that our great pulp and paper manufacturers are working closely with the Administration to see that their industries are kept on a permanent basis. Their forestry engineers are regularly inspecting the areas on which cutting is taking place with a view to getting a sustained yield from their assigned timber.

Recently I was permitted to see a routine report from a forest engineer, a report prepared on a standard, routine form. This report covered such items as average stump height, average top diameter, sound trees cut and left, defective merchantable timber not used, sticks missed in piling or skidding, trees cut high to hold up piles of pulpwood, lopping of branches, and finally, a report on percentage of damage related to reproduction. Among other items, the engineer reported on whether trees larger than eleven inches stump diameter were being put into ties or logs, and if not, why such was the case. He reported as to whether any trees were left when they should have been cut. He dealt with the fact that some cutters occasionally left a top exceeding 3 inches in diameter, the sequence of the cutting and the state of the roads. Please rmember that this one report was typical of thousands of such reports. These engineers talk to the cutters, the swampers, to those in charge of the camps. They are conservation-minded officials, and their efforts are making an impression not

only on the minds of the bush workers but on the thoughts of the whole northern community.

There has been a demand that the Minister of Lands and Forests should arbitrarily set a certain diameter, and that all logs over this diameter should automatically go into sawlogs. Now obviously in any pulp operation there will be a patch of timber where two or three or more trees will be of relatively large diameter. It is not at all practical to ask the operator to send in special equipment, perhaps from a long distance to take out a mere handful of sawlogs. This is just plain silly. Yet when these larger sticks reach the mill, there is a hue and cry about using saw timber for pulpwood.

Again, black spruce, a tree which sometimes runs to very large size, is often encountered. They can be sawn, but the saw tends to bind and burn, with backup and consequent waste. In my opinion, black spruce is, generally speaking, not suitable for sawlogs, but should find its way into the pulp mills. And again you have the hue and cry that sawlogs are being used for pulpwood!

I think the hon. the Minister and the Advisory Committee will agree with me when I suggest that the District Forester should, as indeed he does, work out with the operators in his area a schedule to determine first that sawlog timber exists in the operational area and secondly establish a definite breast-high diameter over which all timber will be cut for sawlogs, poles or tie bolts.

We have heard much about the forest inventory now being completed by the Department. I have visited the

Department's offices on Richmond Street and the unit out north of this city at De Haviland Airport. Ove Four Hundred and Eighty Thousand negatives representing the results of aerial surveys have been accumulated. The enormity of this work is simply beyond belief until one has visited these establishments. The tremendous job this inventory involves is not only giving us an accurate picture of our forest wealth, but the work is of great value to Hydro in laying out pole lines, and to the Highways Department in locating roads.

Out at the establishment at the De Haviland Airport is a huge layout floor 50 feet by 30 feet made of hardwood 7/8th of an inch thick covered with battleship linoleum etched into grids 16 inches square. Imagine the tremendous are which can be covered and examined from the multiplicity of aerial photographs necessary to correlate what even on that big layout would be only a minute fraction of our forest inventory. I think it highly necessary that any member of this House who criticizes this government in connection with our forest inventory should first go out to De Haviland and see for himself what an enormous project this job actually is.

I would like the hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) to extend an invitation to the honourable members of this House to visit De Haviland and also go out to the Research station at Maple so that we do not lightly refer to this great job the personnel in charge of our forest inventory is doing.

I should like to see more research devoted to the

utilization of jack-pine. Many of the paper companies are using a percentage of this plentiful wood in their processes. However, this makes necessary the use of more sulphite pulp to get a proper colour of paper. Possibly more detailed research would indicate something in the way of new processes that would give jackpine a much higher place in the list of woods suitable for pulp manufacture. This tree, incidentally, is more and more being recognized as a source of good, merchantable lumber. Sound jackpine makes excellent lumber. The knots stay in place. Indeed, I think the Department should publicize the value of jackpine for use as sheathing, rough flooring, and generally as a useful and plentiful wood for use in building operations.

About the beginning of this century, the Manufacturing Conditions were incorporated into our Crown Timber Act. These conditions applicable to our soft woods cut from Crown Lands, required that such woods should be manufactured within our provincial borders. I shall not go into the detail but content myself with mentioning the general, basic principles.

There is a tremendous market for our forest products in the U.S.A. Our predecessors in office, as I shall show, fairly well scuttled the Manufacturing Conditions, and one of the first jobs of this Government was to clean up the mess they inherited.

We have up in my part of the Province, some very impressive stands of virgin timber, both pulpwood and sawlog material. I say without hesitation, that I approve to the full the policies of this government which will entirely stop within a limited period, the export of raw forest wealth

taken from our Crown lands until our forest inventory conclusively establishes that a surplus of this material exists outside the economic orbit of present producing mills.

I should not favour at the present time any policy which would prohibit the export of manufactured pulp, for we have to be realistic in such matters. For instance, we manufacture newsprint which enters the U.S.A. duty free. However, there is a tremendous use of fine papers and specialty papers that are dutiable on entering the U.S.A. It would not be to the advantage of our forest industries for us to prohibit the export of manufactured pulp entering into the production of these papers. We are not yet at the stage where we can manufacture these specialties in Ontario for the U.S. market. We could not market them there in the face of existing customs duties. We have still an abundance of wood; we have in the North considerable remaining water powers. In the light of all existing conditions, I suggest, therefore, that our present policies of requiring the manufacture of our wood locally into either pulp or lumber, are sensible and adequate policies.

In dealing with the matter of export of raw forest material, I should like to draw the attention of my friends opposite to certain matters which appear to have escaped their memories.

Back in 1943, about a week after a Progressive Conservative Government took office, they cancelled seven pulpwood concessions which had been made by the former government just on the eve of the 1937 general election -- a mere coincidence of course. Thus was restored to the

Crown 13,729,280 acres of Ontario's forest lands. I am not going into the details. Anyone who cares to see the astonishing series of agreements can find them in the annual departmental report for 1938.

First there was the agreement with the Lake Sulphite Pulp Company, Limited. This concern was required to build a pulp mill up at Red Rock. They made a start; they spent about four and a half million dollars; they went bankrupt owing about three and a half millions. Eventually, and with the help of the department in their negotiations, the Brompton interests took over the wreck, and to the credit of the latter, developed it into a going concern.

Then we come to the General Timber Co., Ltd. This concern was given rights in the Pic River area. They were to build a mill. They were given the right to export 95,000 cords of pulpwood a year plus an extra 50,000 cords a year. They built no mill.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St.Andrew): Do they export?

MR. WHITE: Plenty, plenty.

Then we come to the Pulpwood Supply Co., Ltd. This concern was given concessions in the Long Lac area. They were to cut a minimum of 100,000 cords a year. Clause Three of the agreement to be found on Page 94 of the annual departmental report, reads as follows:

> "All pulpwood cut by the Company under this agreement shall be subject to exportation to the United States of America and shall there be manufactured into a finished product other than newsprint."

This is not all. The Government obligingly built a canal to divert Long Lac waters into Lake Superior to help speed this wood on its way. The Company agreed to reimburse the Government for the cost of the diversion works over a 20-year period. But under a later agreement the Company's contribution was limited to $300,000. Actually, the diversion cost $1,281,522.23. There was provision for building a mill incorporated into the later agreement -- not the original agreement -- one of these phantom mills which Mr. Hepburn was so adept in building when he got loose on the platform.

Then there was the deal with the Ontario Paper Co. Ltd., Co. Bertie McCormick's Company. This Company has a mill at Thorold. They were required to build a barking plant, which apparently was done. This seems to have been the least objectionable of the many deals of this particular time.

Then we go on to the Huron Forest Products,Limited. Of course,they were to build a mill, which was never built. This concern was allowed to export yearly, a quantity equal to that to be used in its phantom mill. With an export limit of 100,000 cords a year.

Then we pass on to the Soo Pulp Products, Limited. Here we find another phantom pulp mill. This phantom company was required to build a 200-ton mill; it could also export an amount equal to one-third of the amount used in the mill. They had a nice little area of 2,300 square miles.

Next we come to the English River Pulp and Paper Co., Ltd., up in my part of Ontario. This concern was to

build a 200-ton mill and a Two Million Dollar logging railway. They were to export up to one-third of the quantity yearly used in the mill, this as to spruce, also other woods encountered in their operations.

Then we come along to the Vermilion Lake Pulp, Limited. The phantom mill here was to produce 100 tons of pulp per day. They would be allowed to export a quantity of spruce equal to one-third of their yearly consumption in their ghost mill. likewise all other types of wood they encountered in their operations.

Then we move along to the Western Pulp and Paper Co., Ltd. Here we find a 200-ton mill provided for; also the usual permission to export spruce up to one-third of the amount used yearly in the mill, plus other pulp woods.

Now, as you know, this Government clamped down on this whole programme. One result has been the construction of not only two huge mills, at Terrace and at Marathon, respectively, but also the complete construction of two of the finest new towns in the whole of Northern Ontario.

Just now, we are hearing a lot about how the Liberal party is against the export of raw forest material. Every log as big as a match stick is going to be manufactured right here in this Province. This is the present Liberal policy. I don't like to make my friends uncomfortable.

MR. FAUQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Do not worry about us.

MR. WHITE: I am sure there is some logical explanation. But before this House rises, I am sure, for example, that my hon. friend, the member for Brant, will

let us know what exactly is the policy of his party. He held the high office of Provincial Secretary when the 1937-38 pulpwood agreements were signed, sealed and delivered. During his brief tenure of office as Prime Minister he sat tight so far as these agreements were concerned. Yet to-day, presumably, he faithfully follows his absentee leader. Just where and why and how does he stand to-day?

MR. H. N. NIXON (Brant): May I ask the hon. member (Mr. White) if the Government is allowing any export of pulp logs to-day, and if so, how much.

MR. WHITE: Are you talking about pulpwood or pulp logs?

MR. NIXON: Pulp logs.

MR. WHITE: If we had cut them off we would have put into bankruptcy about one-half the people you put into business.

MR. FROST: They are being cut down year by year.

MR. NIXON: Cutting the tail off the dog one inch at a time.

MR. FROST: Letting the tail wag the dog.

MR. WHITE: I am sure that out of the wealth of his 32 years of public service in this honourable House, and as an in-and-out member of various administrations, surely he will enlighten us as to his change of heart. Then there is the hon. member for Grey South.

MR. OLIVER: You are darned right there is.

MR. WHITE: I don't think his conversion to the Liberal faith was quite consummated when the agreements were signed, but he finally three in with Mr. Hepburn, and he was

a member of the Government when the hon. member for Brant briefly held the Prime Minister's portfolio. Perhaps both have been converted to the latest Liberal policy as is now being enunciated, but I am sure the rich experiences related to their respective conversions will interest and perhaps intrigue this Assembly.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Did you send a copy of this speech to Mr. Thompson?

MR. FROST: Who is he?

MR. WHITE: This Administration, admittedly, is handicapped in cleaning up an intolerable situation left on its doorstep by the former Administration. Our former Prime Minister clarified the situation, speaking at Port Arthur on October 2nd, 1947. At that time he announced that over a ten-year period export would be eliminated. Immediate reduction in export quotas were ordered, 25 per cent. in some instances, with a stiffer cut in others. He pointed out that cancellation of the agreements to which I have made reference had alteadu reduced export commitments by more than a quarter million cords a year.

I could go into much more detail while on this subject, but I think I have said enough to indicate what created this problem in the first instance and also to indicate that it is being solved, in the interests of the Province, and with reasonable consideration for the companies named in the improvident agreements which created the situation in the first place.

I have no doubt that when our forest inventory is completed we will find there will be a surplus of timber in

our far north which, if not utilized, will remain a wating asset. This timber is that which lies north of the existing timber berths and is actually outside the economic orbit of our domestic mills in the north. Existing mills could not possibly utilize it because they are faced

(Page C-19 follows)

with a delivered-at-the-mill wood cost or not more than $35. per cord and to go beyond even $30. per cord invites disaster. Their end products are groundwood, newsprint, kraft paper, sulphite and sulphate pulps. In the Kenora district right now these mills are faced with pulpwood hauls by truck as long as 60 miles and 100 mile round trip hauls from bush to railhead are quite common. To go farther north to reach some of the remaining stands of virgin timber is not possible if they are to continue to manufacture the types of product I have mentioned. We enjoy a virtual monopoly in so far as newspring manufacture for the United States market is concerned. I feel that when our forest inventory is completed in the next year or two and it should happen to show a surplus of timber north of existing timber berths, then, and only then, should we consider any relaxing of our export ban on raw pulpwood for the manufacture of specialty papers outside of Canada. Even if our forest inventory should indicate there is northern timber to spare and some relaxing of the ban on the export of this raw pulpwood was contemplated by the government, agreements should be of such a nature that when economic conditions permit and expansion of present mills or construction of new mills is feasible, the Government could re-impose the ban after due notice.

MR. W. DENISON (St. David): You have not got a ban. You can drive a team of horses through.

HON. G. H. DUNLAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs) He is not talking about a band saw, he said a "ban".

MR. DENISON: Half a million tons exported last year.

During the term of this administration, we have seen the establishment of the new forest industries at Terrace and

s

Marathon. We have seen material extension of the industries at Kapuskasing. We have seen the Abitibi concern transferred out of a long-standing bankruptcy into an extremely strong and solvent position. We have seen the defunct industry at Sturgeon Falls transformed into a going concern, and incidentally able to use 20 or 30 kinds of wood in its processes.

We have seen a vastly improved system of forest fire prevention. Fire towers have been built where needed. Our Air Force is doing a marvelous work. One important item is the evolution of the Beaver Aircraft -- the result of a working partnership between the skilled technicians of the air force and of a leading manufacturer. Designed as an approach to the ideal aircraft for bush work, the Beaver machine has latterly attracted favourable attention from the U.S. military and aviation authorities.

I want to commend to this House the experimental road built by the Department of Lands & Forests at Petawawa. The entire cost of this road was borne by the Department and its purpose was a two-fold one -- to serve the timber industry and to serve the tourist business. We need many of these roads in northern Ontario. At the present time paper companies are constructing fine roads into their timber limits and bearing the entire cost themselves. These roads are closed to the general public and the excuse given is that tourists are not wanted in the area because of the fire hazard. It is my firm contention that in thefirst place government assistance should be given to build these roads where they obviously will become the main arteries of travel in the areas

and in the second place they serve as access roads into vast timber areas and become invaluable in fighting fires.

Hon. W. S. GILLIES (Minister of Mines) : Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE: From these roads I would like to see networks of bushroads over which jeeps and four wheel drive vehicles could travel encompassing areas of timber so vital to the forest industry in our north country. I have referred to the excellent job our Provincial Air Service renders in time of bushfires. Yet this service is impotent when a fire gets out of control. A system of interlockingroads through our timber stands would give access to the areas and certainly would save immense areas from the conflagrations which could reduce them to ashes and barren waste. Imagine if you will what a system of access roads would have meant in the disasterous Mississauga fire three years ago. Certainly, some isolation and containing of this destructive juggernaut could have been accomplished by those brave footsholdiers of the fire line who slogged it out in smoke and burning ashes from bases established by airplane. Access roads would have allowed them to broaden their fire barriers and move hundreds of men to fire fronts almost at will. I think this Government should give every assistance to operators willing to spend their own money on these roads when the building of such roads also serves the growing tourist industry. One paper company has even suggested to me that it would be willing to pay a fee of so much per cord over and above the regular timber dues it now

pays for every cord of wood brought out over such roads. Roads built by timber operators usually become the access roads into an area even after the timber operation has ceased to exist and, while we wait for the forest to regenerate, trappers, tourists and fishermen use the roads left by the timbermen. What better than the Government make sure the proper base exists in the first place when the road is built rather than let nature close off an access road which would serve as excellent fire protection for a new and growing forest.

I should like to commend our Department of Travel and Publicity in their efforts to grade our numerous tourist establishments in Ontario. This brings up a somewhat vexatious problem up North in relation to Tourist Outfitters Licenses. These licences are issued to certain camp owners meeting the necessary specifications. They give the outfitter the authority to accommodate a certain number of hunters or fishermen at any given time. The issue of the licences ties in with the estimate of the quantity of fish and game in the area, and when the area is "saturated" as the term goes, then no further licences are issued. However, there are very many private camps in these areas; visitors at these camps outnumber the guests at the licenced camps, and actually, certain areas are not only "saturated" but are doubly "saturated." Now very many of these private camps are actually commercial camps, and their guests, more properly paying guests, become so numerous that rather chaotic conditions tend to prevail. I suggest to the Hon. the Minister(Mr. Cecile) that it will be necessary to take some official cognizance

of these private camps with a view to rectifying conditions which are not too satisfactory. Again, the overnight cabins are getting into competitions with the licenced operators. These are now being licenced, but I think they should be held more or less adjacent to the travelled highways. They should not be encouraged back away from the travel lanes. After all, our supply of fish and game is not unlimited, and I think we have here something of a conservation problem.

I am s ure of this. When Ontario led the way by setting up a Department of Travel and Publicity, a Progressive Conservative government again performed an outstanding service to the great tourist industry, and I think about every tourist operator in Ontario will go along with me in this assertion.

Another item of particular interest to us in the North is that of good roads and good highways. I know that roads have to be built and networks enlarged and improvements made largely on the basis of the traffic demands and the incidence of motor vehicle registrations, population densities and many other factors. Up North we have a much lower density of population than down here in the South. We are a country of vast distances. There are many, very many factors which must govern our progress in the matter of roads and highways, not the least of which is the financial aspect.

I am happy to say that we have in the person of the Hon. the Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) a member of the Government who not only realizes our problems but who has done more than any other man in the history of this province to meet them.

The Trans-Canada Highway will be of inestimable benefit to Northern Ontario. The Hon. the Minister, Mr. Doucett) is to be congratulated on the conclusion of negotiations with the Government of Canada that will pave the way for the reasonably early

(Page C -- 25 follows)

completion of this route that is bound to be of such very great value to all Canada and all its provinces. The Progressive Conservative government in this province does not see Canada as a collection of Balkan states to be continually at odds.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Hear, hear.

MR. WHITE: In fact I feel that the hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and his colleagues are to be highly congratulated on their ability to sit down with representatives of the federal authority, and to seek and find reasonably acceptable solutions of their mutual problems.

MR. MacLEOD: Why did they not do that five years ago?

MR. WHITE: We had a change of heart. Perhaps you should have one too.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): A change of leadership, too.

MR. WHITE: Up in my Riding of Kenora in the year that this Government took office -- it was in late summer if you recall - the expenditures on King's Highways were $278,000. They will vary greatly, of course, from year to year, but in 1947 they were more than $4 millions; in 1948, they exceeded $4 millions; in 1949 and 1950, they were a little under $2 millions in each year.

In 1946, the highway from No. 17 to Red Lake was built in record time. This road gives access not only to a big, well-established mining area, but it actually pushes back our northern frontier.

I will not attempt to detail all the work which has been accomplished. However, I would like to call the

attention of the House to the fact that in the last season or two 65 miles has been graded on Highways 72 and 17, and on Richan Road, a famous old northern trail. On Highway 17, 66 miles was surface treated, 19.5 miles was paved with hot mix, and on Highway 70, 21 miles of bituminous mulch was put in place. In the 1948 season nearly a quarter million tons of crushed gravel was put in place.

During the current year 42 miles of grading between Dryden and Fort William has been attended to; the paving contracts have been awarded and the work will proceed as soon as conditions permit.

On Highway 70, Kenora to Emo, contracts were awarded to cover the placing of granular base, and another grading contract for nine miles was awarded.

Also during the season a 9-mile section of road connecting the town of Red Lake with the local airport was completed and opened to traffic.

The machinery pools established in the North are of the greatest assistance to our municipalities, most, if not all of which could not possibly hope to have the use of such modern machinery as is available through the pools if they had to purchase it. This machinery in the North includes 61 power graders, nine pull graders, 28 tractors, 10 compressors and a few trucks, representing a departmental investment of $940,789.48. This machinery is available to our municipalities at a purely nominal rental.

The increased subsidies to our municipalities -- most of them in the North have relatively small populations -- have given us better roads and streets. No policy is more

commendable than that of thus aiding our municipalities. Their governments usually get exceptionally good value for their dollar.

Like every other representative of the North, I shall certainly be working at all times in the interest of more and better roads. We need them and we shall need more of them to help us develop our resources -- our timber, our pulpwood, our minerals, and last but not least our great tourist industry. Mining roads and development roads may be expensive, but I think they pay big dividends. They do much more than benefit merely that part of the population they immediately serve.

The Public Works Deparyment is likewise doing a good job for us in the North. I have already spoken of the new mental hospital at Port Arthur. A central reception building with central stores, kitchen and service department and also a power house are now under way. The famous administration building that I mentioned

(C-28 follows)

before has been adapted for hospital use. I might mention just a few other projects compled in the North during the last few years:

Residences for members of air force personnel.....	42
Garages	6
Boathouses	7
Workshops and Warehouses	15
Cabins for Towermen and Rangers	43
Lookout Towers	50
Chief Rangers and Deputy H'qrs buildings & Offices	11
Wharfs for aircraft, etc.	7
Oil Houses	4

This indicates, I think an awareness of our needs in the North. It means a lot for the comfort, well-being and efficiency of a very large group of our employees.

We hope there will be a decided extension of the policy of this Government to erect public buildings throughout the north country. I know that many are sadly needed -- building which will contain such splendid accommodation as the new public building at Red Lake with its modern lock-up, court-room, magistrate's office, mining recorder's office, police office and apartments for personnel. A public building such as this is needed at Dryden where I live. Agencies of the Crown are scattered through the town in cubbyholes hard to find and trying on the nerves of both the public and civil servants. I know these buildings cannot be put up in a day but I hope the Minister of Public Works will continue his splendid efforts in this regard and we will see, in the not too distant future, Government agencies housed in quarters befitting the dignity of the Crown. I know that such action will be received in the north country with all

the acclaim we can give you, Mr. Minister (Mr. Doucett).

Another project that is of immense advantage to our settlers and others is a large scale and now well advanced drainage scheme. Generally, this scheme includes construction of main ditches to give adequate outlets to carry off waters from settlers' lands, the opening up of natural watercourses by clearing them of dead trees and debris, and the deepening of highway ditches to improve farm drainage.

Up to date more than $2,000,000 has been spent on drainage of this type, covering 768.78 miles.

I could detail many other projects such as the establishment of tourist information centres at Pigeon River, Fort Frances, Sault Ste. Marie and Kenora. Numerous district gaol are being rebuilt and modernized. At Nays, in the Thunder Bay district, a federal internment camp has been remodelled to serve as a temporary industrial farm. In Algonquin Park a new gatehouse is being erected to give a suitable western entrance to this magnificent, natural playground.

I was very happy to hear his Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor indicate that this Government was ready and willing to introduce necessary legislation to permit the granting of old-age pensions at age 70 without a means test and at age 65 as the need required. There will be many "God Bless You's" uttered in this land of ours when that legislation is on the statute books of every province in this country. I sincerely hope that one further step may be carried out in this great and human endeavour on our part. Time and time again I have run across the case of a husband receiving an old-age pension and he and his wife struggling along on this pittance together

because she was a year or two his junior and not eligible for her pension. I sinserely hope the time will come when we may grant both a pension at the same time if the disparity between their ages is small.

As I go about my riding, I hear many compliments as well as complaints. There is a realization that this Government has a keen awareness of the needs of the North. I hear a lot about the excellent work being done by officials of the various departments. The Provincial Police come in for much warm commendation. I am glad they have been given more substantial financial consideration and I hope this will be increased still more. We are, I think attracting a fine type of employee into our civil service -- people who give real confidence as to the workings of the departments. An effieient civil service is one of the greatest assets of a government, indeed of a province. I think members of our service appreciates the fact that so long as there is application to duty, there is nothing to fear from partisanship. A few years ago there was a shameful exhibition on the part of another administration when 3,000 or more people, many of them war veterans, were thrown out of their jobs merely because they were not creatures of a vicious, patronage-hungry incoming administration.

I know the Government has already taken cognizance in a tangible way of increased living costs. However, there are several thousand employees, mostly in the outside service, who are not under the immediate eye of the responsible ministers. I may be forgiven if I say a special word for them -- the forest rangers, often working in difficulty and danger -- the game wardens who have at times a very trying task -- the maintenance men on the highways who keep our roads

open in sub-zero weather -- all these little people, to use the common word,-- I hope that our departments will use them not only justly but generously. Most of them are engaged in important tasks and the nature of their work makes them a very necessary unit in our economy.

(Page C-32 follows)

C-31

I am also glad that superannuation allowances have been stepped up in view of increased living costs. Personally, I am in receipt of innumerable courtesies and services from our employees, and I am sure I speak for all the members of this House when I extend this word of thanks to all the members of the Civil Service.

We have been deeply concerned in the north country over the policy of governments past and present in regard to the question of moose hunting. We were extremely pleased with the forthright steps taken by this government two years ago and acquiesced in by the majority of the Standing Committee on Game and Fish when the season on moose was closed for two years. The people of northern Ontario are watching very closely the action of the government this year in regard to this same matter once again. We know that a census of the moose population has been taken by the department and from reports reaching me, I believe there are some sections of this province where overpopulation of moose might indicate a short open season. I want to impress on the Hon. the Minister of Lands & Forests, (Mr. Scott) that I think the season should be closed to non-resident hunters in favour of resident hunters unless he is certain that the areas of overpopulation can stand the extra toll. In any case, I think he should carefully consider some type of quota system which will control the excesses of the past and retain for us the lordly grandeur of a truly Canadian animal, emblematic of the ruggedness and strength of a great country.

MR. MacLEOD: Hear, hear.

MR. WHITE: I sometimes wonder if our people in Southern Ontario realize what our mineral production means --

to Northern Ontario -- to Southern Ontario -- to all Ontario -- and to Canada. It would be a terrific blow to the North if for some reason or other the mining industry should shut down, but about the first people to fe l it would be the merchants, the manufacturers, the wholesalers and the investors of Southern Ontario. Mining in the North is a big industry. It is a big employer of labour. In one way or another I have been mixed up with the industry all my life, and the best conclusion I can reach is that this industry is only in its infancy.

Canada's mineral production in 1949, was $890 millions, of which sum Ontario produced $315 millions, better than one third of the total. Preliminary figures for 1950, indicate that the year's production will top $350 millions, an increase of at least $35 millions.

During the past 50 years Ontario has produced minerals valued at $5,700,000,000-five billion, seven hundred million dollars.

Gold production is running around the $100 million per year mark. Many factors enter into successful gold mining -- a good property - efficient management -- power at reasonable cost-- and adequate supply of labor -- and finally, reasonably priced and abundant supplies.

The gold mining industry must operate with an eye on the fixed price of the product it produces -- and here we get into the realm of federal, and, indeed, international politics. If the price of gold remains at its present figure, and if mining costs increase as they have been increasing, then the curtain will be rung down on the low grade producers and on many of the junior properties. I do not intend to argue about the many and complicated aspects

of this situation, but I do say that the federal government should not delay in taking whatever measures are necessary to maintain and increase production of gold. It is all very well to argue that gold, one of these days, may be valued only for commercial use. Just remember this. From the very earliest dawn of history gold has constituted the one universal and readily acceptable medium of monetary exchange. Steps should be taken and taken quickly to ensure that this great industry shall remain on its feet. Federal subsidies will help, though only a palliative, and as a principle, I do not like them. Perhaps the remedy in part lies in establishing a free market for gold. The most realistic corrective measure is an upward revision in the price of gold, which as I have indicated has an international aspect with the United States in the dominant position.

Ontario has not a monopoly of nickel production but enjoys something approaching a monopoly for the simple reason that the world's largest nickel deposits are located in the Sudbury area. International Nickel employs about 14,000 men; its present expansion program, so I understand, involves the expenditure of $50 millions or thereabouts. At Creighton Mine a new, 9,000 ton per day concentrator will make possible the treatment of lower grade ores. I mention International Nickel as the largest producer. There are several other nickel companies operating at full blast. The United States has found it necessary to ration this metal, a sufficient guarantee of the prosperity of the important nickel industry for a long time to come. Nickel production exceeds $100 millions a year. Copper, usually associated with nickel and other metals, accounts for some-

where around $50. millions a year.

Then we have the iron deposits which are finally coming into their own. Everyone knows that the Mesabi Range has been for years the very foundation stone of the United States steel industry, and everyone knows that out on the Mesabi they are scraping the bottom right now. The steel industry is the very backbone of America's industrial capacity, and the United States has to secure iron ore to maintain its leadership as a great world power. Recently, United States interests have secured enormous deposits in South America -- a doubtful asset in time of war. There must be a providence working in the cause of democracy when we consider the development of our own iron resources just at this time. The remote deposits in Labrador are an important item. Of more immediate importance to us are the Algoma Ore Properties development up around Michipicoten and the Steep Rock project. These two latter properties have been the subject of much speculation, perhaps I should say prediction. Reliable estimates indicate that their production can be stepped up to 10 million tons a year, some say for the next hundred years. At the present time the Algoma properties are producing around a million tons a year -- the Steep Rock properties around 1,200,000 tons. They will come fully into their own when the St. Lawrence deep waterway comes into being, something I trust not very far distant.

Then there are indications that in Southern Ontario there may be commercial deposits around Marmora. I hope this may be the case. It would be a real boon for Eastern Ontario. I am not sure that there is not a lot more mineral in this part of the Province than most of us realize.

Heretofore, we have associated asbestos production with the Province of Quebec. It is gratifying that the enterprise of our prospectors along with the money and vision of a great American industry have discovered and brought into production an asbestos project up around Matheson which is now milling about,1,100tons a day of this important basic material.

We have not as yet discovered anything in the line of a major oil field in Ontario, but I am sure the success that is meeting the oild producers in Alberta is a great satisfaction to every Canadaim. I recently talked with one leading Alberta producer, and he told me that in his opinion the Alberta fields would prove the equal of the fields of Texas and Oklahoma, two of the world's leading production areas. Alberta oil is now brought to Lake Superior by pipe line -- a line that is likely but the fore-runner of many others. Latterly, we hear something of the possibilities of getting commercial oil in Manitoba, and the prospects are good in Saskatchewan. There is no doubt in my mind that the sane handling of mineral resources in Alberta and Ontario by their respective governments have been a major factor in attracting the enormous amounts of capital that are needed when we begin to locate and to develop the treasures in which our soils abound. It speaks well for the enterprise of our own government when I mention that up around James Bay the Mines Department is putting down test holes by diamond drill to help in interpreting the regional structure of the overlying Paleozoic formation.

We are very hopeful in northern Ontario that the proposed natural gas pipeline from western Canada will be built when Alberta decides the time has come to allow the export

of this product from within her boundaries. I understand an estimate of the costs is being made including a preliminary survey of the proposed route which I believe generally follows the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway across northern Ontario. We, in the north, sincerely hope that nothing will stand in the way of bringing this great utility into the north country and that the Government will do all in its power to aid and expedite the matter when and if the time comes to obtain right-of-way and clearances.

May I say a word or two respecting Hydro. Very gratifying to me are the new developments at Ear Falls, at Aguasabon, at Pine Portage, at the Tunnel Site, and elsewhere in the North. However, I should like to make a suggestion in the interest of the people of the North as to rural Hydro extensions. I think in view of the sparse settlement in many areas and the great distances involved, we should revert to the old rule of 10 units to the mile instead of fifteen as at present. A great many of our people up North as elsewhere grew weary in waiting for Hydro service, and it was a shock to them when the new requirement of fifteen units to the mile as a minimum was introduced this year. In a word, the yardstick that applies in the southern part of Ontario is not a sutiable one for Northern Ontario! I am sure the Hydro Commission in its wisdom will review this particular situation.

The Honourable, the Lieutenant Governor has mentioned that his Government expects a shortage will develop in certain vital and strategic materials and equipment. There will undoubtedly result from this unfortunate circumstance a surplus of Government dollars saved which I suggest could well

be spent in northern Ontario on roads which require little else save the natural gravel found usually close by and wooden bridges the timber for which grows within easy cutting and sawing distance of the bridge site.

His Honour, also spoke of the immigrants we hope to bring to this fair land of ours. Press reports indicate that our federal authorities hope to bring in at least 150,000 people annually to this country. When I tell you that my riding is 230 miles from east to west and 700 miles from north to south, you will realize I am not being facetious when I say that we could gobble up the 150,000 people the federal government will bring the first year and still have a tremendous amount of room to spare. We could give each family a splendid farm, provide the head with remunerative winter employment in the bushland. We could supply his family with almost inexhaustable hydro power -- 270,000 horse power on one river alone in my district. Perhaps you can begin to see how vast our province really is? The City of Halifax on the Atlantic seaboard is closer to the seat of Government of this province than the town of Kenora, administrative headquarters of my district -- and the western boundary of this province is still forty miles to the west.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Are you in favour of a new province?

MR. WHITE: We are getting along fine with what we have, and we are going to continue to do so.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: H ear, hear.

MR. WHITE: What a challenge that is to any Government to develop and populate.

Some of the members here will recall the establishment of the Department of Northern Development in the days of the late Sir James Whitney. This was a great forward step in the development of the North. We have no county organization, as you are aware, and while township organization is proceeding, the process is inclined to be a slow one. Of necessity, we have to look more or less to the Province in a good m[illegible] matters, where down in the South the lesser local governments turn to the County. This makes for delays and complications for our northern people, more especially where several departments of government have to be consulted.

In no spirit of criticism, I should like to make what I consider to be a practical suggestion. It appears to me that the establishment or re-establishment of a Department of Northern Development would be a logical step. I do not know that such a department would assume the form with which we were familiar a few years ago. I am inclined to think that such a department might well take the form of a liaison department through which Northern Affairs could be clarified and channelled to existing departments for ultimate suitable action. I should like to commend this suggestion for some consideration on the part of the Hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the Council.

In closing my remarks here this afternoon, I want to make one more practical suggestion. I have commended the action of the Government in appointing an Advisory Committee to the hon. the Minister of lands & Forests (Mr. Scott). This is in keeping with the Kennedy report and will undoubtedly give the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) a great diversity of opinion from which to draw upon to present policy to his Cabinet colleagues and so to this House for ultimate consideration.

I know that the members of the Advisory Committee to the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) feel very keenly about their jobs, because I took the trouble to write to each one of them and their replies were indicative of the intense zeal with which they intend to tackle a most arduous task. I feel that the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) is well ser ved in this capacity. There is however, the great bulk of opinion of the people of this province to be considered and it is the duty of the hon. members of this House to see that this opinion is brought to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott). Therefore I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there be added to the Standing Committees of this Legislative Assembly, a Committee on Lands & Forests.

MR. MacLEOD: Hear, hear.

MR. DENNISON: Hear, hear.

MR. WHITE: Thank you.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(Take D follows)

MR. O.F. VILLENEUVE (Glengarry): Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the motion for the adoption of the Address presented to this House by His Honour, the Lieutenant- Governor, I am mindful of the honour thus extended to the constituency I represent.

I am pleased to welcome back the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Blackwell) and the hon. member for Russel (Mr. Nault), who, due to illness, were unable to be here last session. The hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Kelly), I understand, has partially recovered from his illness, and we are all very grateful to hear this news.

We are meeting at this time under conditions that are serious in the extreme. In the midst of this era of, perhaps, unparallelled Provincial and indeed National prosperity, we are faced with dangers and alarms that must compel every citizen who loves his country and who values his freedom to turn his thoughts toward the preservation of democracy. It is indeed a strange situation in the progress of civilization, that at this time top priority must be given to the problems of defending hearth and home from the onslaught of Communist armed aggression. Until such time as Russia learns the meaning of ordinary decency and international goodwill, then I say that it behooves us as governments and individuals to take no chances.

We are meeting at a time when considerations of natural safety, and indeed of democracy itself, must transcend all local and partisan considerations. A glance at the front page of any newspaper in these times is sufficient warning to all of us that our primary concern must be the safety and the welfare of Canada and her democratic allies. I suggest that in all our proceedings in the coming weeks, partisanship and differences of views must not blind us to the point where we forget our

common danger.

I should like to extend a word of congratulation to the hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) on the enviable record he has attained during the nearly two years since he assumed his present high office.

Ontario is enjoying a period of marked prosperity. Employment is at an extremely high level.

Our mineral output as to volume, variety and monetary value has exceeded all previous records.

Our forest industries are selling all they can produce.

Our manufacturing enterprises are steadily growing, in number and as to output. The Trade and Industry Branch of the Department of Planning and Development is to be commended for its marked success in attracting new industries to the Province.

Our farm income is high, but it must be realized that our farmers, like all of us, feel the high cost of living, and increases in the revenue from the sale of their products are scarcely commensurate, in some aspects, with the rising costs that face them in all quarters.

In my part of Ontario, the cheese factory is an important feature of our economy. We are finally free from the pegged price of cheese, formerly 26 cents a pound, and in the free market it now brings 37 to 40 cents. Until November 1st, 1950, milk going to our cheese factories was bringing only $2.20 per cwt., 3.5 average test, whereas under present conditions it brings the farmer $3.25 per cwt., a very sizeable item indeed and a gratifying result for the dairy farmer. However, it comes at a seasonal period when very little milk is produced.

In Agriculture, the Dairy Herd Improvement project resulted in the enlistment of farmers in 44 districts of Ontario in an effort to arrive at correct costs of milk production. The costs arrived at averaged $2.83 per cwt., a figure, in the light of selling prices, indicating that revenue from cheese production has been out of line with the rest of our economy during the period up to November 1st, 1950.

There are wide discrepancies in milk prices as affecting various districts. I venture to suggest that we shall, with the cooperation of the distributors, perhaps arrive at some system of pooling our milk output so as to give a more equal return to all groups of dairy farmers.

In Glengarry, the Department in 1950, initiated a county-wide soils test. We must give, in increasing degree, the scientific guidance and advice that today is necessary in all branches of agriculture. This is particularly necessary when we consider that it affects the comfort, prosperity and welfare of our whole farm population. The Glengarry experiment, will, I hope, be subject to wide extension.

I should like to commend the continued interest and assistance given to our Fall Fairs. Such exhibitions as the Central Canada at Ottawa, the Western at London, the Canadian National at Toronto and the Royal Winter Fair have, shall I say, world reputations. Now, in the world of sport, the successful major league operator does not neglect the minors that are really the foundation of his structure. Therefore, I suggest that continued and more generous aid be given to our local fairs. Thus will our exhibitors be encouraged, and their local successes will aid them as they begin to exhibit in the larger field.

Just a word about the Ontario Veterinary College. I must express my regret at the continued illness of its distinguished principal, Dr. A.L. MacNabb, a distinguished scientist with an international reputation. I know you will join with me in the wish that he may have an early and complete recovery.

Taken as a whole today, the Ontario picture is one of general prosperity and well-being. This happy circumstance reflects the abundance of our natural resources, our geographical position, and the skill. industry, thrift and application of our people.

Our revenues are soundly and economically applied. Grants amounting to around $90 millions a year are made, mostly to our municipal bodies, so that local taxation on our homes and farms is kept at least within manageable bounds. There are limits to the totaltaxation that any people can safely bear without strangulation of the economic structure.

The hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has given this Province distinguished representation in more than one Dominion-Provincial conference. His efforts have already gone a very long way in ironing out Dominion-Provincial problems. Indeed, I think we have entered an era in which these problems will now be met and solved in an atmosphere of mutual goodwill.

Our governmental costs have increased provincially and municipally. Yet our Ontario Administration has reasonably met the increasing demands on the Treasury with the imposition of practically no new taxation except an Amusement Tax -- this is marked contrast with the Ottawa scene. I think there is very little quarrel with the Amusement Tax, for as we all know, this is essentially a hospitals tax, and I know of no cause

more deserving of our support.

I earnestly commend the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and his colleagues on the progress they have made in dealing with the Government of the nation. But as I have tried to point out, considering the governmental revenues of Canada, of the Provinces and the municipalities, I feel that the time has come when less of our total government revenue should go to Ottawa and more to the Provinces and the municipalities.

Without going into detail, I merely leave this thought with you, in the full confidence that the hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and his colleagues will ultimately enlist federal co-operation to the point where an adequate remedy will be found for our pressing and mutual problems.

One of the most beneficial pieces of legislation passed by this Government is the Community Centres Act of 1949 - this in so far as our rural areas are concerned. Under the 1949 legislation 233 projects have been aided.

This program, the result of local enterprises, plus leadership and financial assistance from the Province, is one of the very finest factors to be injected into the rural Ontario scene. All over Ontario these halls and fields and arenas are bringing to our young people the opportunity to enjoy life in village and in hamlet.

Back in 1942, provincial grants-in-aid of education were about $6,900,000. They are now approximately $50 millions a year. These figures speak for themselves. Education costs, like all other costs, have seen material increases.

We are giving generous and increasing aid to our universities. Scholarships and bursaries are available to our students who are seeking higher education.

Let me say this: In Ontario no boy or girl today with a normal equipment of brains and ability, with normal ambition and with reasonable parental guidance, can fail to get an excellent education.

In rural Ontario, we have an acute awareness as to the state of our roads and highways. There is a reason why we have in Ontario the best highway system in Canada, in fact one of the best in the world. I suggest that any resident of this Province who is not satisfied with our highways take a trip elsewhere in Canada. He will come back here extremely appreciative of the fact that our highways system is something in which we can take a justifiable pride. One of the big reasons for this happy state of affairs is that we have a Minister who knows his job.

Down in the East, we appreciate the hon. the Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett). Indeed, the same sentiment goes for all over Ontario. He takes time out each year to get around by visiting the Road Committee of every county council in Ontario. No previous Minister of Highways has ever taken the trouble, year by year, to thus study municipal needs and problems at first hand. He is doing a really grand job for this great Province. His experience in public life covered a good many years in the municipal field, and his first-hand knowledge of municipal affairs is reflected in the present happy relations as between his department and our municipal bodies.

Back in 1943, when our party was entrusted with the responsibility of forming a government, the Highways Department paid road subsidies to about 450 municipalities. They

amounted to $3,600,000 a year. Today, these subsidies are paid at increased rates; they are paid to 1,339 municipalities; they amount to $23,000,000 a year. As in the education field, this means less taxation against homes and farms. But it means more than this. It means better municipal roads, better streets. I do not know of any measure of assistance that is more appreciated.

Down in my riding of Glengarry, we appreciate what has been done for us by the Department of Highways. Highway #34, a very important road to us locally has been repaved for a distance of 22 miles. Re-surfacing ten miles from Lancaster to the Quebec border on No.2 Highway will be completed this summer. Grading and widening will be in progress preparatory to paving west of Alexandria on Highway #43 this year.

Back in 1942, under a former government, Glengarry did not have a very high rating. The expenditure that year in Glengarry on provincial highways was a little over $39,000. In 1949-50 the expenditure was more than $458,000, and for the year just closing it will be around $557,000, with the completion of 1950 contracts that are now let. We now feel we are part and parcel of this great Province, something that we did not enjoy in the past.

Municipal subsidies paid with respect to Glengarry Riding in 1943 were about $65,000. For this year they will be very close to $300,000. I suggest that this is a big item in the municipal scheme of things. The public memory may be short. It is not so short, however, that it will not recall what our friends opposite actually did when they had a nine-year opportunity to display their goods.

I have no doubt we shall hear some of the detail regarding arrangements which have been made whereby Ontario will complete its share of the Trans-Canada Highway. After preliminary

negotiations with the Federal Government, the hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), the hon. the Minister of Highways, (Mr. Doucett), and the hon. the Federal Minister of Transport, along with their officials and advisers, attacked this project in the light of a problem to be solved, and they were not long in coming up with a solution. The route selected appeals to me as being designed to serve acceptably a majority of our people. As I see it, the people of Canada generally feel that an all-Canadian highway is required as being entirely consistent with our national development. I hope that current shortages of steel and other essential materials will not unduly delay completion of this great project.

Our Highways Department is now faced with normal yearly expenditures in excess of $75 millions. A year ago the hon. the Minister announced a 5-year plan involving the total expenditure of $150 millions, this over and above the normal program. This plan contemplates many important additions to our existing highway network.

Among the many important items is a new, dual-lane highway commencing in the Windsor area, thence running easterly to the Quebec border. Beyond any shadow of doubt this will be a necessity, indeed an urgency, when the St. Lawrence development gets underway -- and as to this development, the sooner the better. I do not want to appear selfish about it, but the sooner this project comes into being, the sooner will all Eastern Ontario come into its heritage.

I should also like to compliment my colleague in his capacity as Minister of Public Works in relation to the completion of the Ontario Hospital and School for Mental Defectives at Smiths Falls. I have no doubt its present planned capacity of 2,400 patients will be fully utilized, more especially in

the light of the formidable and long-standing waiting list at the Orillia institution.

In relation to municipal drainage, I have been pleased to note the quick implementation by the Public Works Department of the recommendation from the Select Committee on Conservation to increase the provincial grant from 20 per cent to 33-1/3 per cent. This has been a real help to the farmers of Southern Ontario. Perhaps the hon. the Minister in his wisdom may see his way clear to increase the provincial grant to 50 per cent. I suggest this would result in far-reaching benefits.

I could not conclude without saying a kind work on behalf of my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Welfare. His real interest in the less fortunate members of the Ontario community have won for him a fine place in the esteem of his fellow citizens.

There have been, as you know, upward adjustments in the Old Age Pension scale.

The Department of Welfare now contributes 25 per cent of the cost of maintaining Children's Aid Societies.

Another important item is in relation to Homes for the Aged. These worthy institutions that are such a necessary link in the welfare chain formerly were almost entirely a municipal responsability. Our recent legislation now enables the Province to pay not only 50 per cent of the cost of building or extending these homes, but also makes 50 per cent of maintenance costs a provincial responsibility.

At Cornwall in my part of the Province a new Home for the Aged is coming into being, and I assure you my constituents are highly mindful of the fact that the humane and enlightened

policies of this Government are a large factor in enabling them to provide comfort and happiness for many of our aged citizens.

Our policy on this side of the House has been to avoid as much as possible new taxation. Our taxation burdens are already a heavy load.

However, I would like to say this. There is in our midst quite a substantial body of what we term unemployables, people handicapped by accident or disease, who at present are more or less dependent on municipal relief. If some way could be devised provincially to take more cognizance of this group, I think it would be a matter of general commendation. The cost would not be very great, and I am sure the hon. the Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) would have our general support in working out any scheme of provincial assistance herein.

Now, I wish to say a word about our great Hydro enterprise. We have a special interest in Hydro in the Eastern section of Ontario. As I have intimated already, in my humble opinion, when the St. Lawrence development has entered the realm of accomplishment, then Eastern Ontario comes into its own. Such centres of industry as the Niagara peninsula, Hamilton, Windsor, Kitchener and the capital City of Toronto trace their era of great industrial expansion back to the inception of the Hydro enterprise.

Since this Government took office, new developments have been launched to give Ontario an additional 2,567,000 h.p. Out of this 2,567,000 new h.p. 864,000 h.p. is now being delivered.

One of the most striking phases lies in the growth of rural electrification. Electrification has been one of the

most crying needs on our farms. I have here a brief and simple table which shows what this Government has accomplished in this direction:

Rural lines constructed by the Hydro Commission since 1947 including the estimated figures for 1951 in this Province	16,565 miles
Rural consumers added in that period	163,795
Bonuses paid by the Government towards construction of these lines	$41,945,551.00

In short, I shall give you the actual figures and results as to the position in relation to this development in the County of Glengarry.

Total amount rural lines constructed in 1947	303.53 miles
Total amount rural lines constructed 1947 to 1951	247 "
Total number of miles	550.53

Rural Consumers to 1947 - Glengarry	1,445
Rural Consumers 1947 to 1951	1,458
Total number of consumers	2,903

An increase of over 100% in 5 years.

Notwithstanding the enormous new Hydro developments which have been and are being accomplished under this Administration, it is plain that Ontario will again be short of power in a few years unless we get on with the St. Lawrence scheme.

I want to see the Eastern part of Ontario given

the same opportunity for industrial growth as has been afforded the West, the Centre and the North. Eastern Ontario is tired of standing by with 2,200,000 horse power going to waste on her doorstep.

It is desirable to have the deep waterway and the power development dealt with at the same time. For example, the iron deposits of the Messabi range are nearing depletion and the steel industry is turning to Steep Rock and to the Labrador deposits. For their proper development we must have the deep waterway.

But whether the waterways and power developments are carried out as a unit or otherwise, if Washington will not move, then New York and Ontario must at least get on with the power development.

I do commend this Government and the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission for their earnest efforts to clean up this bottleneck in the power development program. The St. Lawrence development is vital for Eastern Ontario -- for all Ontario, and I say it would be a shocking state of affairs if we had presently to turn to steam development on a big scale while 2,200,000 horse power continues to go to waste because a few Senators think there might be some loss of business in a few seaport cities to the south of us.

I shall leave it to others of my colleagues to speak in detail as to the fine record of the Administration in relation to various other departments.

I should like, however, to offer a word of congratulation to the hon. the Minister of Travel and Publicity (Mr. Cecil). His department is doing an excellent job of publicizing Ontario with corresponding benefit to the tourist industry. Information

centres have been established to greet and to assist incoming tourists at all important border points. The licensing and inspection of resorts makes for improved standards.

I should also like to express my admiration for the good work being accomplished under the able direction of the hon. the Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger).

The Conservation Authorities Act was placed on our statute books in 1946. Since then thirteen Conservation Authorities affecting as many watersheds have come into being. Conservation is a world problem.

Also enacted in 1946 was the Planning Act. Constant advice and assistance is given to our municipalities in respect of zoning by-laws, building by-laws and municipal planning generally.

With the co-operation of the Trade and Industry Branch, 116 new industries have been brought to Ontario.

Before I conclude, I should like to congratulate my hon. friend, the member for Durham (Mr. Foote), on his well-deserved promotion to the important post of Minister of Reform Institutions. His honourable record with the armed forces which won for him the highest military decoration in the figt of His Majesty, and his interest in the welfare of his fellow men, fit him admirably to carry on the work so well established by his predecessors.

May I also congratulate the hon. member from Grey North (Mr. MacKinnon Phillips) on his promotion to Cabinet rank. I am sure the hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is fortunate in being able to include among his immediate circle of advisers one who possesses outstanding professional and business experience in such marked degree.

In conclusion, may I say that I propose, in my humble way, to approach our problems in a spirit of tolerance and good-will - something I consider doubly necessary in view of the nature of the times through which we are passing. The issues are too grave to warrant any other approach to our problems. The banner Province of this great country we call Canada has a great responsability to the nation, to the Commonwealth, to all who cherish freedom and liberty.

(TAKE E FOLLOWS)

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Has the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) had an opportunity of reading the Bills we have here? If so, we might proceed with them.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, in regard to these Bills, we are just aching to get at them.

MR. FROST: Perhaps a little holiday yesterday was all right. Order number 3.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 3rd Order, second reading of Bill No. 37, "An Act to amend the Racing Commission Act," Mr. Frost.

THE RACING COMMISSION ACT

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move second reading of Bill No. 37.

MR. H.C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, is the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) not going to give us a little information on the year's experience with this Commission?

MR. FROST: Well, Mr. Speaker, this Act is not what some people implied it was. I notice that some people implied that in this Bill was a change in the taxes, the racing tax and so on. That is not the intention, of course, of the Bill at all.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): That was not a budgetary look, was it?

MR. FROST: Well, it came from some of the clergy. It may have been a leak of some sort or other but I can

assure you I did not give them anything to that effect. Now, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is simply this: first of all, to broaden the powers of the Commission in the matter of investigation. We have learned a very great deal during the past year in connection with the necessity for investigation in these matters and to afford the Commissioners protection which is given to public officers in regard to matters of that sort.

Now, another matter has to do with the regulation section so that the Commission may exercise certain powers directly without coming under the Regulations Act. Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of that is this, the Commission's actions are administrative, not legislative, and in a number of cases to avoid the publication of voluminous regulations it has been felt that they could be kept out of the Regulations Act and to be treated as administrative matters. That is the gist of the other sections of the Act.

I would say to the hon. Member (Mr. Nixon) that last year in embarking upon a Racing Commission instead of the old voluntary organization which the racing people have, we first of all gained a good deal of experience. I was very pleased with this. In talking with a number of persons connected with the racing business, the owners of horses, owners of harness horses, those who operate tracks and others, I have found that there is general satisfaction with the work of the Commission. The Commission has been doing a good, fair job and I think that in many ways there has been a general improvement of conditions on the tracks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult matter.

The matter of gambling as the House knows is purely a Federal matter. Those who are interested in this problem might go back and read the case submitted by Mr. Rainey when he was Attorney-General of this Province through the courts about 1921. A reading of that refers to the answers that were given by the Supreme Court of Ontario and will indicate the problem involved. The province can regulate but the province has not anything to do with the matter of promotion of gambling on the tracks whether that be by pari-mutuel machines or by books. Now, myself, coming from a part of Ontario where these things are not indulged in to any extent, at least as far as I know, I have learned a great deal in the past year. I must admit that I did not know last year that it was legal to operate books on certain tracks, but it is under the Criminal Code, it is legal to operate books on harness racing tracks. That raised a great question. Much of our difficulty in Ontario is the big time gambling which takes place and which is so difficult to check and which comes from the operation of bookmakers.

(TAKE "F" FOLLOWS)

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes one would look at the matter of licensing bookmakers as the best method of controlling that problem. On the other hand, I think myself our people would be scandalized by the licensing of bookmakers. I do not know that such a thing has ever been considered. It is done in the Old Country, but we are faced in this Province with this situation , that there is not a thing we can do in this Assembly -- not a thing. It is perfectly legal to keep a book at the harness horse-race tracks.

This creates a division between the Federal and the Provincial governments, and you can understand the difficulties there are in connection with the problem.

I think the Commission has done a very excellent job. I am not giving that as my opinion, because, after all, my opinion may not be worth a very great deal. For myself, if I were inclined to go to a track, they keep me so busy here, I would not have time to go, so I do not know about these things. However, the police, the operators, the breeders, and the horsemen generally all tell me the Commission is doing an excellent job, and I believe that that is the case.

What I have said is really not within the four corners of this Act which is an Act to strengthen and amend the present Act which was passed last year, but in view of my hon. friend's question I give him this as an answer to the position as we have it to-day.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) would permit a question? Does the hon. Prime Minister know how many

decisions of the Commission have been appealed.

MR. FROST: "Really, I do not know."

MR. HOUCK: "Could we find that out?"

MR. FROST: "Perhaps none." I do not think there are any."

MR. HOUCK: "Oh, yes, there were some."

MR. HARRY WALTERS (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, has anyone in the Federal Government been interviews with a view to eliminating bookmaking on the tracks, and allowing pari mutuel betting on all tracks, harness racing, and all others?

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, that, of course, raises a problem. I may say this: I received notice there have been no appeals from the decisions made by the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the question by the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) which related to bookmaking on the tracks, of course, raises a very great problem. I found this; that at some of our Fall Fair tracks, bookmaking has been permitted for years; in fact, the bookmakers pay the track a certain percentage of their purses. Amongst our rural people, these are vested rights and interests with which we do not like to interfere.

In regard to the illegal bookmaking which goes on in this Province and throughout Canada, we are faced with the problem of the use of the wires by interests which are really in many ways criminal interests.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And the telephone.

MR. FROST: Yes, and the telephone. There has been a lot of talk about the Windsor situation. I want to say this about the Windsor police; the Windsor police, and all

of our police, - the Provincial Police and the municipal police -- are under a very great disadvantage from this standpoint; we have provincially no control over telephone, telegraph, radio and television communication, and our files are full of cases where we have tracked down certain interests which are using telephones and other means of communication for gambling purposes, and perhaps cases may have been taken by the Province, but within a day or so the restoration of the services is ordered by the Transport Board.

I have some very interesting correspondence. I would be very glad to give the House, correspondence with Senator Kefauver, who is investigating crime in the United States, and with hon. Mr. Garson at Ottawa.

I would say the cure of the present trouble is on a higher level of Government than ours. After all, we have laws to prevent the use of the mails for the purpose of defrauding people; surely there can be some way of tightening the wire services in this Country, to give our police a chance, because the local police -- Provincial and Municipal -- are under a very severe handicap in that regard.

And I can see that much of the difficulty in the Windsor situation has come from handicaps which are imposed by the administration of Federal laws, both in Canada and in the United States, and I have so stated in letters to the Senate Committee, and also to hon. Mr. Garson.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Surely, arising out of the last remark by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost); I can easily understand the statement by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) with respect to wires which cross the Border, but surely what

he said about the wires and telephones could not apply to those within the Province.

MR. FROST: They do apply to those within the Province. These things are Federal. They are Federal communication systems,

Going back a number of years, when I first became Treasurer, in 1943, I zealously pursued the collection of taxes due to His Majesty's Government, and I did my best to collect them. I found in connection with bets which were placed through the bookies, that we could not collect any taxes, and we endeavoured to check that down and were closed down very promptly.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) can get some very interesting references from the Provincial Police Reports and I am sure the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) will have no objection to showing him privately some of the cases we have had in that regard, cases where there were batteries of fifty or sixty telephones in one room, and where we endeavoured to check up on that we have run afoul of the Transport Board. Even if we did not run afoul of the Transport Board, we found we ran against Federal regulations relating to communications generally, and we have been placed in an almost impossible position.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I take a strong view of this state of affairs. I think the time has come when there should be in connection with the wire communications of this Country, some limit to the privileges extended to interests which are not lawful interests. It is a difficult problem, I know, the matter of personal privilege enters into

it. I know the question of controlling messages and tapping wires is a very highly doubtful procedure, but surely there must be some way of dealing with it. I have put that problem before the House here and I have put it before the Federal Government -- both the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) and myself -- personally and by letter, and with the intervention of the Commissioner of Provincial Police.

We recognize the difficulty of the problem, but wurely it should not be a case where criminals can be excused and given advantages over our own police forces, and I would say to the hon. member for Windsor (Mr. Ellis) that we found one of the difficulties in that community is the fact of the privileges which people enjoy in connection with the communications which are national and international in their aspects.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, I was much interested in several of the remarks made by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), particularly with respect to the remark he made that in his opinion the solution to gambling and bookmaking in connection with horse-racing would be through the licensing of the book business.

MR. FROST: No, I did not say that.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): He did not say that.

MR. FROST: I raised the question, and said that I thought the suggestion might scandalize some of our people, books are legal in some places and I suggested that perhaps something after the English licensing system might apply, but I did not say that I advocated that. I was too careful for

that.

MR. ELLIS: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) did not go far enough in his remarks. I am firmly convinced the trouble we hear about in respect to illegal booking business is that we have two systems, the legal booking business on our harness-racing tracks, and the illegal booking business which is prevalent in all of our cities, and I am of the opinion there are no more illegal bookies operating in the City of Windsor than in any other industrial city. I do feel it is a big problem insofar as gambling on race tracks is concerned, and this may be partly due to the fact that in Toronto you have tracks operating where people can go and legally gamble on the horses, and we recognize their right. In other communities they have not that right to the extent that they have not tracks operating in those communities, and undoubtedly there is a great deal of money to be invested in illegal booking because of the fact that race tracks are not operating there.

In the final analysis, the greatest fear of the bookmaking industry is the fact that it brings about corruption within the confines of Government, particularly Municipal Government and that is why I think there has been so much public attention drawn to the situation at Windsor, which is no greater than any other place in the Province of Ontario. There have been suggestions made that there has been corruption in high circles of Government because of the illegal operation of the books. I believe that could happen in the City of Toronto. If anybody wanted to make a charge that there was somebody in the City Hall allowing the books to operate, then there would be the same situation in the City of Toronto as we

had in Windsor.

I do not believ the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) went far enough. I believe he should pursue the theme, that there is one solution to the bookmaking industry, and that is if you are going to allow legal betting, you should also allow illegal betting now to become legal if it is far removed from the tracks themselves. In other words, license the bookmakers and allow the individual who wants to bet half a dollar on a horse to do so through legal channels, then take off the tax from that money, which now goes into the pockets of the corrupt. I am not sure of that, but I think it does.

I am sure that the time will come,when the people of this Province will realize this problem can never be solved until you have legal betting and then you will have created conditions whereby corruption will not be suspected within our Municipalities with respect to the operation of the illegal books.

In my opinion, there is only one answer; either do away with all legal tracks and give nobody the right o bet on the horses, or else go ahead and face the problem as it should be faced and license the operations of the handbooks where there is a demand for them. I think then you will have solved the problem as it exists in Windsor and in Toronto and in every other City throughout the Dominion of Canada at the present time.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I just say a word in response to what the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Ellis) has said. Please bear in mind again that the whole field of gambling, and the permission to gamble, either by pari mutuel

betting, or by the books, or the licensing of them, is a Federal matter. That is something which I think is clearly beyond the Province to deal with.

(TAKE "G" FOLLOWS)

I want to make this plain, Mr. S;eaker. As far as I am concerned, rather than make it freer for these fellows to operate, I would tighten it up.

Miss AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Hear, hear.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I would tighten it up in every way I could. I would go so far as to prevent the use of telephones, radios, wires and television for that purpose. I think it is bad business, and that is what I would do if I could do it. Unfortunately, those things are beyond our powers here to do. We have not got control over communications and, again, the matter of gambling is a matter which is exclusively reserved to the Dominion Parliament under the British North America Act, and any provisions that are contained are in the Criminal Code.

Our position in the matter is that we have been -- and we will continue to be -- somewhat "on the outside looking in". It is a difficult, an extremely difficult problem.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to give the Racing Commission rather extensive powers and rights, especially the rights to grant licences. The Bill provides, for instance, the licensing of almost everybody in and around and near a race track. It provides for owners, trainers, jockeys, apprentice jockeys, grooms ---

MR. FROST: We have to watch them all.

MR. SALSBERG: --- jockeys' agents, jockeys' valets, exercise boys, tradesneb, "and such other person in or about race tracks".

That covers a very wide field, Mr. Speaker, and I wonder if that is a justifiable demand. I notice that the sub-section following the one I quoted from provides that the Commission shall have the right to: "fix and collect fees or other charges for licenses". Now, I do not suppose that the Government looks upon this as a source of revenue. I am sure that is not the reason they want to license so many people.

An hon. MEMBER: Do not be too sure.

MR. SALSBERG: I can understand once you grant licenses you are obliged to charge a nominal fee, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that such extensive power would be justified - if it is not, I repeat, for taxation purposes, then I say it would be justified only if the experiences of the Commission have been such as to conclude that improper practices were engaged in by people in and around the racetrack.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that as a member of this House I would vote for this Bill only if the House were advised that the Commission found that perhaps fraudulent practices were engaged in, that races were "fixed". I understand there is such a thing as "fixing" a race. Now, if races were "fixed", and if horses were "doctored", if improper practices were engaged in, then I say we would be justified in giving the Commission such extensive powers. If, however, no such practices were uncovered, then I could hardly justify the extension of licensing powers to the Commission on so wide a field and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that hon. Members of this House and the public at large would be anxious to hear from the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) whether he justifies the extension of this power on grounds of improper practices which

were uncovered and which call for a tightening up in a form of license control of almost everybody in and around the race track.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, this section itself makes statutory what has been done by regulation in the past year. Actually, this section does not vive any more powers than have been generally exercised under this section passed last year.

Mr. Speaker, you can count on it that our tracks here in Ontario have been maintained at a very high level, that the matter of the type of thing my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) mentions -- "fixing" and the drugging of horses and that sort of thing -- such a thing as that is not countenanced in any way, shape or form. The purpose of a section of this sort, to be quite frank with you, is to assure that that remains the case on our tracks in this Province and the Commission feel, and my own advisers and officials who have had to do with this feel that it is desirable that the Commission should have these powers.

We have followed the experience which has been gained on American tracks. We have some of our commissioners to look over conditions that prevail on some of the big American tracks, and I want to assure my hon. friend (Mr. Salsberg) that our tracks in this Province are clean and the intention is that they should remain that way.

MR. SALSBERG: I am very glad to hear that.

MR. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) has been speaking about something more or less than the powers held by the old I.R.C.A. before the I.R.C.S. came into being.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. HOUCK: (Niagara Falls): We have to have these regulations on any race track.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. HOUCK: I wonder if the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) could tell me if he has any idea whether the Commission is going to allow night harness racing this summer ?

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I think that is a very broad question. I do not want to interfere with the Racing Commission and what it does,and with its judgment, but I have to say that you only have to read the newspaper to see the difficulties they are keeping with the big-time gambling that is arising from night racing in the States and to see that it is pretty unsatisfactory there, and I would think the Racing Commission would certainly hesitate to permit the introduction into this Province, under leeways that exist in Federal Laws, of a situation which is causing a great deal of concern in a lot of the States of the Union.

MR. H.L. WALTERS (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, actually night racing in harness racing has been a boon to breeders and the handlers of smaller stables in the United States. As regards the increase of illegal betting from night racing, I think the contrary is the case. These people have built very fine establishments and they draw very large crowds. Consequently the betting that is going on is going through legal channels and not through illegal channels. I think these things have to be taken into consideration.

Besides, I have been wondering, - and it is just a thought - the trotters and pacers have a much different temperament than the runners, and trotters and pacers can operate

under these lights without any danger to drivers or to spectators. I do not know whether the runners would run as well, and I am also wondering if in this case there is not a little tug of war going on between the handlers of the runners and the handlers of pacers and trotters. I have no brief for either. So far as I am concerned, it is horse-racing whether it is trotters and pacers or whether it is runners, but it appears to me there is a little tug of war here, a little opposition ot night racing from those interested in the runners.

I cannot see any reason, in view of what has occurred across the line, that night racing in trotters and racers should not be able to operate here, and in that way, Mr. Premier (Mr. Frost), I think you are going to eliminate to some extent illegal gambling because you are going to draw more people to the track. Not to allow it would no doubt in the long run harm legal gambling, and in that way I think it is a poor position from the practical standpoint and from the idea of eliminating illegal gambling.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 4.

THE COUNTY JUDGES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 4, second reading.

Bill No. 38, an Act to amend the County Judges Act.

M . PORTER (St. George): (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 38, An Act to amend the County Judges Act.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I would

like to say a few words with respect to this Bill. I had intended making a few comments when the House would be sitting in Committee, but I believe I might just as well do so now.

Apparently this Bill has for its purpose to add another junior Judge to the County of Wentworth, within which is situated the city of Hamilton. I am not opposed to the principle of the Bill but I think it is too restrictive, and I would like to see it enlarged so as to include Carleton County. As I understand the Bill as it stands now, - unfinished -

MR. PORTER: Well, it does. Mr. Speaker, that was already covered by the House.

MR. CHARTRAND: Not the way I would like to see it covered.

MR. PORTER: Oh, oh. I thought they were all satisfied down there in Carleton County, - - -

MR. CHARTRAND: There are several junior judges in the County of York and there is a junior judge in the County of Carleton.

No, there are several junior judves in the County of York and then previously there are junior judges in each of the Counties of Carleton, Middlesex, Sudbury and Thunder Bay, and two junior judges in the County of Essex.

It is now provided by this Bill to add another junior judge to the County of Wentworth.

I brought this matter to the attention of the predecessor of the hon. Attorney General, (Mr. Porter) Mr. Blackwell, when he was in office, and expleined to him the

difficulties of our county judge in the County of Carleton. At that time I was informed that if the County Judges in Carleton were too much pressed with work, some arrangement could be made for assistance from a judge of an adjoining county. At that time I thought that a solution could be worked out along these lines but I have made enquiries from the proper authorities and have been informed that this arrangement has not lived up to expectations. True enough, some county judges from adjoining counties were asked from time to time to assist our county judges in Carleton, but there were serious objections, whieh are quite obvious. In the first place, when you ask for the services of a judge from an adjoining county, you deprive that county of its local judge and the people are very resentful about that. I recall that on the occasion of an appointment to a county judgeship, the reeves, councillors and the mayor proceeded in a delegation to the Minister of Justice in order to secure the appointment of a County Judge residing within the county and who would spend most of his time within the county.

Now, when some residents within a county wish to see the county judge and they are informed that he is 55 miles away from his court house and nobody knows when he will be returning, it is certainly not satisfactory.

From the standpoint of the city of Ottawa, when seeking the services of an adjoining county judge, it has been found to be very impractical for this reason, that whenever there is litigation, we usually know when it starts but we do not know when it may end. Sometimes it is believed that the subject matter will be disposed of in no time and then

a pressing legal point develops - something unforeseen - and accordingly the senior judge has found it impossible to determine in advance when he will require the services of a judge from a neighboring county. What has been done from time to time is for some county judge from an adjoining county to take over the rental cases and the division court, but that is about the limit of all assistance given and received. And we have seen times such as when there were the spy cases where one judgge was occupied for two or three months judging theses cases, and if the other junior judge had to make the rounds of the County of Carleton, there was no judge in Ottawa to take care of the situation for some period of time.

I understand the appointment of the judges, the number of judges is usually a matter that isrelated to the population. Now, I have made inquiries from the Statistical Department in this building and I find that the County of Wentworth has a population of 246,000 and that of Carleton County is 241,000, making a difference of only about 4,000, and I see that Essex County has a population of less than 200,000. So that I feel that if there is necessity with regard to the population of Wentworth County to have two junior judges, I believe the case is just as cogent for the City of Ottawa, or rather for the County of Carleton, which has only 5,000 less population that the County of Wentworth.

I think this matter should be looked into. I understand that representation has already been made, but the matter has always been p ostponed. Now the occasion arises to settle the situation with the County of Wentworth and I feel the same solution should apply to Carleton County.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall any representations from Carleton County having been made since I have held this office.

MR. CHARTRAND: I made them in this House to your predecessor.

MR. PORTER: Yes, I know, but you have never made it to me.

MR. H.C. NIXON (Brant): He is making it now.

MR. CHARTRAND: I am making it now.

MR. PORTER: You never made it to me. This is a matter we look into, our practice is that when the business of a court becomes voluminous, too much so for the present judges or staff to handle, generally we hear it through the county council or other municipal council as the case may be as to the conditions, then we are in the position to investigate that and the Ottawa authorities also investigate it. We do not wish to open up nwe possibilities of the appointment of judgeships unless we are sure that the Federal authorities are also in agreement that it is necessary, so that they will be prepared to make an appointment. The situation my hon. friend (Mr. Chartrand) has mentioned is entirely new to me, and this Bill deals with one situation that was drawn to our attention and has been investigated and we are satisfied that it is a reasonable and essential thing to do. I will be very happy to go into this further with the hon. member (Mr. Chartrand) and in due course perhaps we could extend this Act as it may become necessary from time to time.

MR. CHARTRAND: That is all right, yes.

MR. PORTER: In the meantime, I suggest the Bill go

through as it is.

MR. NIXON: May I ask the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter), does Ottawa ever appoint a junior judve without legislation of this kind ?

MR. CHARTRAND: No, it cannot be done.

MR. NIXON: Can it not be done?

MR. PORTER:,Not unless it is provided for in the Judges Act. The number of junior judges in a County is set out in this Act. As it happens, a year ago Sudbury applied for an additional judge and we amended this Act accordingly at that time, and other amendments have been made on previous occasions.

MR. NIXON: Why should a province dictate to Ottawa whether they can appoint an additional junior judge?

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): That is the rule.

MR. NIXON: Do we pay their salaries, or any costs of their work?

MR. PORTER: No, well, of course, Ottawa has the right, under the British North America Act, to appoint judges and Ottawa pays the judges, but the appointing of county judges is governed by provincial legislation. The same applies to Supreme Court judges. Under the Judicature Act it is provided that a certain number of judges shall be High Court judges and a certain number of judges shall be appeal court judges and then once the court is established under provincial legislation, then and only then the Federal Government simply appoints the judges to those positions. It applies equally to county judges as to the others, and I generally take the

position that from time to time when the need arises we extend the Act providing for the appointment of additional judges where we are satisfied that that is an essential thing to do.

(TAKE "H" FOLLOWS)

MR. A CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Could the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) tell me how many county court judges there are in the province at the present time. Is it fifty-eight, approximately?

MR. PORTER: It may be, I could not answer that off-hand.

MR. C.H. TAYLOR (Temiskaming): May I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter), is the Mining Court Judge appointed by the Federal Government?

MR. PORTER: The Mining Court Judge is appointed by the Federal Government.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in moving adjournment of the House I would very much like to get the consent of the hon. members opposite to have all the leaders speeches on one day, tomorrow, following the Ottawa practice. Now, that would involve the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) going first, of course, as is his right, followed by the government side and then followed by the satellites over there.

MR. H.C. NIXON (Brant): Satellites of who?

MR. FROST: Perhaps you people are satellites of my own here.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): They were yesterday.

MR. NIXON: Do not count too much on it.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, if that is impossible, of course, we would have no night session tomorrow but I had hoped to have a night session and keep ahead with the business of the House. We are meeting earlier this year at the

insistence -- not at the insistence but at the suggestion of the hon. members opposite and I certainly do not want to waste time, I am anxious to get ahead and not lose these couple of weeks we have tacked on to the front end of the Session. Yesterday we were held up because the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) had not had an opportunity of reading some of these Bills. I would like to go ahead tomorrow and have a real leaders day debate and clean that up in the one day if the hon. members would agree.

MR. F.R. OLIVER (Grey South): Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know that it is very material to me whether we proceed tomorrow evening or not, except that I had what I thought was an understanding that we were going to adjourn the debate at the conclusion of the Prime Minister's speech tomorrow and that then I would go on the next day. On the basis of that understanding I made a dinner and an evening commitment that I cannot very well break and I am sure the House would not want to see me go into action without any preparation at all. I had thought it would be better from all points of view if we could have followed the procedure of last year but now the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) suggests that we follow the procedure at Ottawa. Well, if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) had told us that yesterday we would have tried to accommodate him in that regard but to leave it to this late hour and then seek torearrange the whole thing is a little hard to take, perhaps. I suppose we can take it if we have to, but I do not know why you have to rush so hard on the very first week that you need a night session. Surely we can avoid night sessions until later on in the Session. I do not want to press my

views, if it is the wish of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to go on tomorrow night, we are going on so far as I am concerned.

MR. FROST: I might say that the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) spoke to us about this some time ago and suggested we have night sessions early.

SOME hom. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Then, Mr. Speaker, we will go ahead with the afternoon session tomorrow and at the conclusion of the first two addresses if there is time we will take up Bills and go ahead with them.

Mr. Speaker, I moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.04 of the clock p.m.

- - - - - - -

ONTARIO

Third Session
of the
Twenty-Third Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

Toronto, Ontario, February 7, 1951, et seq.

Volume V

Wednesday, February 7, 1951.

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

Hon- (Rev.) M. C. Davies, Speaker

Volume V.

Wednesday, February 7, 1951.

- - - - -

P R O C E E D I N G S

of the

THIRD SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE, PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO, WEDNESDAY, February 7th, 1951, AT THREE O'CLOCK P.M.

- - - - - -

HON. (Rev.) M.C. DAVIES, Speaker.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The following petition was read and received:

Of the Corporation of the City of St. Catharines, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the expropriation of certain lands in the Township of Grantham; and for other purposes.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting reports by committees.

MR. H.A. STEWART (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to submit the report of the select committee appointed to prepare the list of members to compose the select standing committee authorized by the House and move its adoption.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The Select Committee appointed to prepare the lists of Members to compose the Select Standing Committee of the House begs leave to present the following as its report:-

Your Committee recommends that the Standing Committees ordered by the House be composed as follows:-

COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Messrs. Calder, Cathcart, Dennison, Doucett, Edwards, Frost, Grummett, Hamilton, Jolliffe, Murdoch, Nixon, Oliver, Patrick, Pryde, Robson, Stewart, Wismer--17. The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Messrs. Baxter, Brown, Calder, Chartrand, Dowling, Fullerton, Harvey (Nipissing), Harvey (Sault Ste Marie), Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Leger, Mackenzie, MacLeod, Miss Macphail, Messrs. Martin, Millard, Morrow, Murdoch, McDonald, Nault, Nixon, Patrick, Porter, Pringle, Reynolds, Robson, Scott (Beaches), Stewart, Temple, Thomas (Elgin), Thomas (Ontario), Villeneuve, Walters, White--33. The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine members.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE BILLS

Messrs. Allen, Brown, Calder, Cathcart, Chartrand, Cox, Dempsey, Dennison, Downer, Durbar, Easton, Edwards, Ellis, Grummett, Hall, Hamilton, Hanna, Harvey (Nipissing), Houck, Janes, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Leger, Mackenzie, MacLeod, Miss Macphail, Messrs. Martin, Millard, Morrow, Murdoch, McDonald, McEwing, McPhee, Nault, Newman, Oliver, Patrick, Pringle, Pryde, Reynolds, Robinson, Sandercock, Scott (Beaches), Scott (Peterborough), Stewart, Temple, Thomas (Ontario), Thornberry, Villeneuve, White, Wismer--51. The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine members.

COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS

Messrs. Allen, Blackwell, Brown, Cathcart, Chartrand,

Edwards, Fell, Foster, Fullerton, Goodfellow, Griesinger, Hall, Hamilton, Isley, Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Leavens, Murdoch, McEwing, McPhee, Park, Parry, Phillips, Pringle, Rea, Reynolds, Robson, Scott (Beaches), Stewart, Thornberry, Walker, Walters--31. The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Messrs. Allen, Baxter, Brown, Calder, Cathcart, Chartrand, Dennison, Dent, Doucett, Downer, Edwards, Ellis, Fell, Frost, Gemmell, Goodfellow, Gordon, Hall, Hamilton, Hanna, Harvey (Sault Ste Marie), Houck, Hunt, Janes, Johnston(Simcoe Centre), Jolliffe, Kelley, Leavens, Mackenzie, MacLeod, Martin, Millard, Morrow, Murdoch, McEwing, McPhee, Nixon, Oliver, Park, Parry, Patrick, Phillips, Pringle, Pryde, Reynolds, Robson, Sandercock, Stewart, Temple, Thomas (Elgin), Thomas (Ontario), Thornberry, Villeneuve, Walters, Wismer--55. The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine members.

COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Messrs. Baxter, Brown, Calder, Cathcart, Challies, Dent Gordon, Griesinger, Hanna, Harvey (Sault Ste Marie), Hunt, Leavens, Mackenzie, Martin, Morrow, Murdoch, Pringle, Pryde, Salsberg, Scott (Beaches), Taylor, Thomas (Ontario), White--23. The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON MUNICIPAL LAW

Messrs. Allen, Baxter, Brown, Cathcart, Challies, Dennison, Doucett, Dunbar, Easton, Edwards, Ellis, Fell, Foster, Fullerton, Gemmell, Gordon, Grummett, Hall, Hamilton, Hanna, Harvey (Nipissing), Houck, Janes, Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Jolliffe,

Mackenzie, Martin, Murdoch, McEwing, McMillan, McPhee, Nault, Parry, Patrick, Pryde, Reynolds, Robinson, Salsberg, Scott (Beaches), Stewart, Thomas (Elgin), Thomas (Ontario), Thornberry, Villeneuve, Walker, Welsh, White--47. The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine members.

COMMITTEE ON LEGAL BILLS

Messrs. Blackwell, Calder, Chartrand, Fell, Foote, Gemmell, Grummett, Hamilton, Janes, Jolliffe, Murdoch, McDonald, Nixon, Parry, Patrick, Porter, Rea, Reynolds, Scott (Beaches), Stewart, Walters--21. The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of seven members.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

Messrs. Allen, Baxter, Dennison, Dent, Downer, Easton, Edwards, Ellis, Foster, Goodfellow, Gordon, Hall, Hanna, Harvey, (Nipissing), Hunt, Isley, Janes, Jolliffe, Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Kennedy, Leger, Mackenzie, Miss Macphail, Messrs. Martin, Millard, Morrow, Murdoch, McDonald, McEwing, McMillan, McPhee, Newman, Nixon, Oliver, Parry, Patrick, Phillips, Pringle, Pryde, Reynolds, Robson, Stewart, Taylor, Temple, Thomas (Elgin), Thornberry, Villeneuve--47. The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine members.

COMMITTEE ON FISH AND GAME

Messrs. Allen, Baxter, Cathcart, Cox, Dempsey, Dennison, Dent, Dowling, Downer, Easton, Ellis, Foster, Fullerton, Grummett, Hall, Hanna, Harvey (Nipissing), Harvey (Sault Ste Marie), Houck, Hunt, Isley, Janes, Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Simcoe Centre), Jolliffe, Leavens, Leger, Mackenzie, McPhee, Martin, Morrow, Murdoch, McDonald, McEwing, McMillan, Newman,

Nixon, Phillips, Pringle, Pryde, Reynolds, Robinson, Robson, Salsberg, Sandercock, Scott (Peterborough), Stewart, Taylor, Villeneuve, Walker, White, Wismer--52. The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine members.

COMMITTEE ON LABOUR

Messrs. Calder, Cathcart, Cox, Daley, Dempsey, Dowling, Downer, Edwards, Ellis, Fell, Hall, Hunt, Leger, Mackenzie, Millard, Murdoch, McPhee, Newman, Nixon, Park, Parry, Phillips, Pryde, Rea, Reynolds, Salsberg, Walker, Walters, White, Wismer--30. The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine members.

COMMITTEE ON MINING

Messrs. Brown, Calder, Cox, Daley, Dempsey, Dowling, Foote, Fullerton, Gemmell, Grummett, Hamilton, Hanna, Harvey (Nipissing), Harvey (Sault Ste. Marie), Houck, Hunt, Johnston (Parry Sound), Jolliffe, Leger, MacLeod, Morrow, Murdoch, Newman, Pringle, Rea, Taylor, Temple, Thomas (Elgin), White, Wismer--30. The Quorum of the said Committee to consist of nine members.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

HON. G.A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following report:

Report of the Minister of Lands and Forests for the Province of Ontario for the fiscal year ended March 31st, 1950.

Report of the Minister of Agriculture respecting co-operative marketing loans made under the Co-Operative Marketing Loans Act for the year ended December 31, 1950.

30th Annual Report of the Public Service Superannuation Board, Ontario, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1950.

64th Annual Report of the Niagara Parks Commission for the fiscal year ending October 31, 1950.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (PRIME MINISTER): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I should like to take this opportunity of tabling the correspondence which was referred to yesterday in the debate on one of the Bills, the Bill relating to the Racing Commission, correspondence which I had with the Hon. Senator Kaufauver, the chairman of the United States Crime Investigating Committee and also with the Hon. Stewart Garson, Minister of Justice. Previously some of this had been released to the press but this brings the matter up to date. I see there is an extra copy here and I will give it to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and if any of the other hon. members would like a copy I will try and obtain them. In any event, I will table that correspondence now.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I should also like to refer to a question which was directed to me yesterday by the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Temple) which I misunderstood at the time.

I thought the reference he made had to do with the Liquor Control building on the Esplanade or down on Fleet Street to which I had been referring in my remarks before the orders of the day. In looking up the press to-day, I find that I inadvertently did not reply to this question so I take this opportunity of doing so. In sodoing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to table a press release which was given at Ottawa on the 5th of December, 1950 and which referred to that particular situation. On that day the Federal Government had issued Order Number 1 in relation to essential materials. The Federal Provincial Conference was on at that time and a number of the Cabinet were in Ottawa and I immediately issued this statement and I think this will answer the Hon. Member's (Mr. Temple) question:

> "In view of the tense and difficult world situation and particularly the grave threat of war, The Honourable Leslie Frost announced curtailment of construction by the Liquor Control Board of Ontario of all buildings requiring the use of structural steel. Order Number 1 issued by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, under the Essential Materials (Defense) Act, effective January 1, 1951, restricts the use of structural steel in construction related to the handling of liquor, beer and wine, and such use is subject to the issue of a permit by the Steel Division of his department.
>
> 'It is the intention of the Government of Ontario' said the Prime Minister 'to co-operate

to the fullest extent with the Government of Canada in directing the use of steel to purposes best suited for the security of the nation, and in consequence, in accordance with Order No. 1, the further construction of buildings intended by the Liquor Control Board of Ontario to be used for the handling of liquor, beer or wine will be deferred until the present emergent situation has eased.' "

I used the word "emergent" with all due credit to The Toronto Saturday Night. That was going further than had been requested by Order No. 1. Order No. 1 said that permits had to be obtained. Immediately on the issue of this Order No. 1 we cancelled all building, we cancelled the Front St. building completely in order that these materials, if they were essential, would be be available. This is a point the hon. member (Mr. Temple) will be interested in. This was not covered by our Order No. 1. We went further and said:-

"Not only will the Liquor Control Board of Ontario refrain from requesting permits for the use of structural steel for these purposes but applications for licenses for the sale to the public of liquor, beer or wine will be scrutinized carefully by the Liquor License Board and will be refused in those cases in which the granting of licenses would result in diverting structural steel from more essential purposes."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was the release which was made

at that time. I want now to go further than that and say, , that since that time I have asked Judge Robb not to grant licenses or to permit the enlargement or alteration of premises which will use, in any substantial way, other materials which are essential for housing and such for what you might call priority requirements in Canada. That, of course, would include cement and a great number of other things. The point is this, Mr. Speaker, we are desirous of doing everything possible to assist our Country in this present situation and to curtail the use of what we might call essentials in developing all the priority projects in this Country. I think that answers the hon. member's (Mr. Temple) question.

MR. W.H. TEMPLE (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) for this statement. I might say, I am, of course, in full accord with it. I think it is long overdue. Even so it is welcome at this time as far as I am concerned personally. Might I ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) this further question? Licenses have been granted in the Toronto area for liquor outlets in vacant fields. Will these buildings be proceeded with or will these licenses be cancelled?

MR. FROST: Well, if it involves building that will be subject to review. I have not discussed that matter, of course, with the Chairman of the Board. Of course, we have this situation, we have attempted to encourage the building of bona fide hotel premises in this

City, that is something that is very much needed. One has only to stay in one of the large hotels in this City to know the inconvenience to which the travelling public is put in the matter of finding accommodation in the City and we would like to encourage the building of bona fide hotels and I think that is in accordance with the resolution of the Toronto City Council.

I think perhaps the reference to which the hon. member (Mr. Temple) has referred goes to the fact that certain licenses have been authorized and conditioned upon building permits to meet the situation. And now, as to whether these matters would be priority matters in the building of a hotel, a moderate or large hotel, I think would depend on the Ottawa priority.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

HONOURABLE LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 18.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

Order No. 18 resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for an address in reply to a speech of The Honourable The Lieutenant-Governor at the Opening of the Session.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if there is one statement in the Speech from the Throne this year with which we can all agree it is the statement that great changes in conditions had occurred during the year which is passed. With that we can all agree. I think we can all agree also that some of thes changes have been for the better and some for the worse.

It is not surprising that the Speech from the Throne took cognizance of an international situation which does effect the work of the Government and of every other Government and now reaches into every home in the land.

(TAKE "B" FOLLOWS)

I recall, Mr. Speaker, that in my remarks on a similar occasion last year, I drew attention to the significance of a great event which had occurred not long before the 1950 Session, and that great event was the passing of China to the Communist world. I referred to the fact that five hundred million people had fallen, as it were, from the frying pan into the fire, or, in other words, had fallen under the domination of a totalitarian group in another country.

In the light of what has since transpired, there is nothing that I have to withdraw or retract from what I said on that occasion. Indeed, I doubt if the world yet appreciates the significance of what took place in China due to the bankruptcy of its leaders, and the bankruptcy of some other nations' leaders, a year or more ago.

These great international events, which increased the difficulties of many governments -- including very probably the government of Ontario -- also brings to mind the fact that in the strange economic system which has been ours for a generation or more, the advent of an international crisis, while it creatts new problems, also removes other problems which are usually with us in times of peace.

A great deal of unemployment which was so noticeable a year ago is not noticeable today, but not, I suggest, because of any effort on the part of the government of Ontario or the government of Canada, but rather because of the efforts of others in other lands and because of the deepening international crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I will say very little more about the world crisis today, except this: that the conflict which is developing throughout the world today is not merely a conflict

of military power, or a struggle for territorial control, but it is a contest between ways of government, and different ways of life, and our responsibility is greater than it ever was before to make our democracy effective and successful.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I would hope that the work of this Legislature, -- the work of all hon. members of this House, both within and without the House, will reflect the urgency of the situation, and reflect our conscience and desire and make our democracy more real, more effective, and more successful.

One suggestion I have to make, Mr. Speaker, is that we should hear more fully in this House, particularly from hon. Ministers of the Crown, the best explanations they can give of their policy and of the work of their departments. There was a time a decade ago -- or even five years ago -- when it seemed the government had one spokesman, and one spokesman only. I am happy to say that times have changed; there has been some improvement. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) today has shown a greater capacity for team work, and a willingness to put forward his colleagues from time to time.

Nevertheless, there is still a degree of ministerial reticence, and I would like to see the end of it. We suspect there may be some hidden talent behind the curtain of ministerial reticence, and we are reminded of the poem:

"Full many a gem of purest ray serene,
The dark, unfathomed caves of ocean dear,
"Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
And waste its sweetness on the desert air."

We hope to hear, Mr. Speaker, fully and clearly from each and every hon. Minister, an explanation of the work of his department and an explanation of the policy of the government in reference to all matters under his jurisdiction, and we will accord them the same frankness which they accord us. I may say they can count on us to be generous in our praise where praise is due, and be severe in our criticism, where criticism is due.

Now, the Speech from the Throne very naturally refers to the inflationary tendencies which are upon us, and while I do not disagree with all that is said on the subject, I must point out that we have to recognize the causes of inflation and the responsibility for the condition.

Inflation in this country arises directly as a result of the decontrols undertaken rashly and hastily by the Federal Government; if has arisen from the fear of war; it has arisen from the rearmament program only beginning to get under way, and, as the hon. Prime Minister and Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) knows, it has also arisen because so many people throughout this country are anticipating or expecting the reimposition of controls which the Federal Government has so far failed to do.

We feel very strongly that many of the price increases in recent weeks and months have been due, not to shortages, not to any real need for a larger margin, but because of uncertainty, or because of the expectation that within a few days or a few weeks or a few months price controls would be restored by the Federal Government. Too many people throughout this Country tried to "Beat the gun"

in respect to price control, and this has given an impetus to rising prices.

One result of inflation, of course, has been an increase in employment, and a reduction on unemployment. But, let us not imagine we are free from unemployment, particularly in connection with seasonal work. There may be a shortage of skilled labour, particularly in certain trades, which I believe is the reason why the Government is seeking to bring skilled workmen from elsewhere, but there are areas where unemployment is still a serious problem; there are areas where there is a substantial amount of unemployment amongst unskilled labour, so let us not imagine we have no unemployment problem.

Even if mass unemployment has been removed from the picture, we have a serious problem we did not have a year ago. The whole question of construction, to which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) referrxd to yesterday, has become much more serious than it was a year ago.

There is one other observation I have to make about the effect of inflation, and we must not forget it, Mr. Speaker.

In our preoccupation with what are sometimes designated as "the great affairs of State", let us not forget that the burden of inflation falls most heavily upon those who are least able to protect themselves - pensioners and annuitants, and others, who find today their purchasing power is not what they expected it to be, and whose contracts of insurance, and whose state assistance, and so forth, have been affected by rising prices.

The wage earner -- and in many cases those who earn salaries -- are in the position to demand and obtain more remuneration. Producers -- many of whom are organized today -- are in a position to demand and obtain higher prices, at least until the return of price control. But the position of our pensioners and annuitants is becoming increasingly difficult, and they are the least able to protect themselves. Oh, I know we have sympathy for them, the sympathy of every hon. member of this House, but we should give them more than sympathy.

Two years ago there was a great deal of discussion in this House about our old age pensions, I know in this connection that since 1948 the general level of the pensions is considerably higher, but so is the cost of living, and it is very questionable whether the pensioners today are in any better position than they were two years ago; in fact, they may be in a worse position than they were two years ago.

There is a moral aspect to this question, Mr. Speaker, and that is the obligation society has to the old age pensioners, to those who have earned superannuation by their efforts, and their own contributions throughout the years. In their cases - and their cases alone - we, are, in fact, confiscating a large part of the savings of a lifetime. I think we should look to our consciences and do all we can for them.

Another very serious result of the inflationary trend is what it is doing to rents and housing.

So far as rent control is concerned, we welcome, of course, the acceptance in principle by the Government of

its responsibility for rent cootrol in the event the Federal Government does not change its mind. But we have yet to see the Government legislation, and of course, "there's many a slip twixt the cup and the lip" in these matters, and therefore we can't give unqualified endorsation which might be premature.

I would like to add, in connection with rent control that the Government's approval of the principle is belated; it comes much later than the decision of the Saskatchewan government. It was known a year ago -- two years ago -- that the Federal Government intended to withdraw from the field of rent control, and at that time the province of Saskatchewan accepted the Federal Government's offer that the controls in effect late in 1949 would be continued until April, 1950, if the Saskatchewan Government elected to pass legislation of its own.

The Saskatchewan Government did pass legislation of its own, and I may say it has had satisfactory results.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the problem is not as critical in that province as it is here. We have larger urban concentration, and we have a more industrialized province, but my information is that the Saskatchewan Mediation Board which was established has brought very satisfactory results.

I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that up to date it has disposed of 3446 cases, and I am also informed that of the 3446 cases, there were less than ten complaints, that is less than 10 complaints of all that number were taken to a higher level from the decisions of the Board.

I think we can say that if the Ontario Government had

stepped into the breach instead of faltering, as it did, then rents would not have spiraled as they have in certain places.

The Federal Government does not publish rent indices for each province, but it does for certain urban centres. I call the attention of the Government to the fact that in the city of Saskatoon the rent index rose from 125.3 in December, 1949, to 126.1 in November, 1950, an increase of less than one point in eleven months, in the city of Saskatoon, which is a western city, but has been a crowded city.

In that same period, Mr. Speaker, -- and I am giving the last date for which figures are available -- the rent index for Toronto rose from 124.6 in December, 1949, to 140. in November, 1950, an increase of over 15 points.

This is the comparison between the city of Saskatoon, and the City of Toronto, and it shows the penalty we have to pay for the Government's failure to take the same action as Saskatchewan took a year ago.

There are many more things I could say about rent control, but I do not want to inflict upon the hon. members of the House an unduly lengthy speech, and I have other matters to discuss, but I do say that it is to be deeply regretted that the action which is to be taken at this session with reference to rent control is so belated, that to a large extent it will be like locking the stable door after the horse has been stolen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, rent control is a very big issue in practically all the urban centers of this Province.

But there is another issue which has relation to rent and housing, and the policy of the Government, and that is the position of our municipalities today.

The Speech from the Throne was, to my mind, amazingly complacent about the position of our municipalities. It asserts "that the financial position of our municipalities is receiving the constant attention of my Government. The impact of inflated costs has created difficulties for all governments. Nevertheless, the municipal position is strong."

Now, Mr. Speaker, even assuming we can agree with that assertion about the debt position, the Government is overlooking one thing in regard to our municipalities today, the municipal tax payers, and that is that the impact of inflation on the municipalities is different from the impact of inflation on the government.

What has happened to the Government of Ontario in these inflationary times? The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has been fortunate in that he has found it necessary on only two occasions to ask for an increase in taxes. If I am wrong, I can be corrected. There was an increase in the race track tax, and the so-called hospital tax, which was, of course, an amusement tax, and there was the gasoline tax which he took over from the Federal Government but, broadly speaking, in recent years, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has been very fortunate indeed. Ordinary revenue which was about $191,000,000 in 1947-48 rose to $215,500,000 in the following year, and $228,500,000 the year after that.

He admitted a surplus in 1947 of over $25,000,000, over $9,000,000 the following year, and over $8,500,000

last year, but we all know in this House that the admitted surpluses were somewhat less than the actual surpluses by reason of his practice of placing in the sinking fund more than the statutory requirements.

It would be no exaggeration to say that actually the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has been coasting along with the inflationary tide, with surpluses totalling over $75,000,000 in three years. That is the effect of inflation on the Provincial Government.

Why? Because it receives its revenue from diversified sources, such as revenues from the Liquor Control Board, revenues from the gasoline tax, and revenues from corporation tax, and so on.

But what is the effect on the municipalities?

The municipalities get some of their revenues from the provincial government, and I suppose they should be grateful for whatever crumbs may fall from the provincial table.

(PAGE B-10 FOLLOWS)

MR. FROST: When did $91,000,000 become a "crumb"?

MR. MOLLIFFE: Oh well, crumbs in terms of other problems.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) knows what I am talking about. He knows that inflation does not increase municipal revenues from real estate taxes except to a very small degree.

Oh, I know you can tinker with assessments, you can re-assess and change the picutre, but the fact is that when you have a big increase in prices, if you have inflationary trends in the Province, it does not assist the average municipality in its taxes on land. And that is the reason for the municipal difficulties today. That was overlooked in the Speech from the Throne. I presume it was an innocent mistake, but let us put it right now.

The municipal position is not as happy as the Government pretends it is, and many of the Government supporters are well aware of that fact. Indeed, if I may refer to only two outstanding papers - I do not want, as you know, to inflict lengthy quotations from the press on the House, but here we have the Toronto Telegram, not unfriendly to the Government, generally pleased about the Speech of the Throne, but even The Toronto Telegram was obliged to say this:

> "In one respect the message to the Legislature yesterday was disappointing. It not only lacked a primise of relieving the municipalities of the heavy costs of social welfare services, or of more help for them in bearing the increasing cost of education, but it seemed to imply

> they are in good financial condition, and that their one source of revenue - real estate - is well situated to meet their financial responsibilities. In many municipalities the reverse condition exists, but as yet there is no ray of hope for them from Queen's Park."

And then to quote from a smaller newspaper, but I think a representative provincial daily, the St. Catharines Standard, we find:

> "There were other important subjects in the Ontario program, and some disappointments, too. Inflationary costs have put heavy burden on municipalities which are forced to raise the bulk of revenue from taxing real estate. The Government made no promise of release. There are rumors in the air about a 3% sales tax agreement with the Dominion Government, that tax to be imposed by the provincial government. It will be the most unpopular and unwanted tax in Ontario's history if it is imposed, and overnight will impose the heaviest burden on those least able to carry in."

Imay say, Mr.Speaker, that these statements reflect a view which is widely held throughout this Province. It is not sufficient to remind the municipalities that they do not owe as much money as they did a few years ago. It is not sufficient to remind them that the Provincial Government is giving them more in grants than a year ago. These facts have to be considered in relation to the municipalities and their responsibilities today, and the increases in municipal

costs which are beyond their control, even more so than the costs which are beyond the control of the government. And, as I mentioned, the revenue from real estate has not been subject to expansion. That is true, as against revenues for provincial purposes.

Now, considering their difficulties, it is no wonder that the housing problem looms so large in a provincial way.

I was interested in hearing the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) yesterday deplore the Federal Government's second step to cut back housing in this country. I do not think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) recalled there was a previous step which affected housing. He will remember that some months ago there was a change in the rules as to lending on the part of the Federal Government - lending values were fixed as of January 1st, 1950. That, in itself, of course, had the effect of increasing the down payments required for new housing at a time that costs were rapidly going up. That was the first step.

Yesterday, the Federal Government came along with the second step. The second step which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) reported from hon. Mr. Winters statement yesterday rather than simply applying the brakes, will prove to have a most disastrous effect on initiation of further housing development. It may mean, of course, we shall have more completions within the next six months, but then housing will come to a dead-end.

(TAKE "C" FOLLOWS)

I am not going into detail on this housing question. There are others better qualified than I to deal with it, but quite apart from the Federal Government decisions, I say, Mr. Speaker, that the housing record to date in this country is woefully inadequate. Most of the houses being built have been too costly for purchase by the average Canadian family. It is rapidly approaching the point where even the smallest house cannot be constructed for less than $9,000 or $9,500. That represents considerably more than two years' income of the average Canadian family, and Central Mortgage and Housing as well as all other housing authorities, concede that a family should not commit itself to purchase of a house for more than doulbe the annual income of that family. Even the houses which have been built -- and for which the government, in a mysterious way, takes some credit -- even the houses which have been built, Mr. Speaker, are in many cases not of the kind most needed in this country.

The Dominion-Provincial program of a year or two ago, which called for the collaboration of the Dominion, the province and the municipalities, is rapidly approaching, in my opinion, a complete breakdown. I agree with the hon. Prime Minsiter (Mr.Frost) when he suggested yesterday that if we are going to restrict building, that housing is one of the last places where we should restrict it. I agree entirely, but that is a negative approach. It seems to me there should be a much more positive approach, and I am sure that if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) were to call a provincial-municipal conference,which has not yet been done and which should have been done long ago and which was promised long ago, I am sure if he did that he would get the whole-hearted

co-operation of the municipalities in a program to persuade the Eederal Government that housing should receive some priority. We are told in a grandiose way about a rearmament program; we are told in a grandiose way about the future development of this province, the coming of more immigrants, and expansion of our industrial economy, the building of new industries, all of which most of us would heartily welcome. But, Mr. Speaker, surely, as prattical people, we must know that these developments cannot take place satisfactorily without a very great increase in housing accommodation throughout Ontario.

I understand that surveys have indicated a need for at least 160,000 new units in Canada each year. Our population is about one-third of the Canadian total, and our development is such that we would certainly need at least one-third of the new houses, probably a good many more, but we are not building one-third, we have never built one-third of 160,000. And we are apparently about to build even less, and at the same time invite large numbers of immigrants to this province, and new industries, as in that glowing pamphlet which has just been issued by the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr. Griesinger).

AN hon. MEMBER: You do not benefit by new industries, I suppose?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I would hesitate to locate a new plant in Ontario if I thought the workers in that plant were going to have not place to live except possibly pup tents, or the kind of accommodation which was put up during the war, which certainly will not attract the workers required for new industrial developments.

I would like to see the government, Mr.Speaker,

take a more vigorous and positive approach to the matter of housing, as well as to the matter of priorities, which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost)discussed. He said yesterday the Federal Government has not clearly indicated which priorities are to be recognized. Well, that does not surprise me. The Federal Government has been slow indeed to indicate anything very definite about almost anything during the crisis of recent months.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE; In civil defence, in the defence program itself, in the whole problem of the inflation in connection with the housing matter, in connection with what is expected from agricultural producers, all along the line we have had little or no leadership from the Federal Government, we have had a state of utter confusion.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: To that extent the government has my sympathy, but I say, Mr. Speaker, that if the Federal Government fails to state what the priorities should be from a national point of view, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is not relieved of his responsibility for determining what the priorities for the time being shall be, in any event, He has indicated in a very general way that he would give priority to houses as opposed to a new warehouse for the Liquor Control Board. Well, that is a beginning, Mr. Speaker, that is a beginning anyway, but I think we should hear much more on that question from the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). I am looking forward to hearing very specifically and clearly from the Minister of Highways and Public Works what he has to say on this question of priorities. What comes first in the building of, or the restoration of, highways and bridges?

And public works? I would like to hear also from the hon. Minister of Planning and Development (Mr.Griesinger) in connection with the same subject?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Surely the government has some scheme of priorities in this situation? Surely the government is not awaiting a lead from a government which seldom ever gives a lead about anything until the eleventh hour or later? They should know from experience by now that they will wait a long time before they receive any clear directives from Ottawa on matters such as these. The difficulty being, of course, that Ottawa is still under the spell of the Mackenzie King tradition,which was never to do anything about anything until you have to.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not want to see this government fall under that same spell.

MR. A. A. MACLEOD (B ellwoods): Why hot?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I call on this government to give effective leadership and direction to the affairs of this province in a manner which will commend the government and commend our people, as being people who are not afraid to face the issues.

Let us not be afraid to make up our minds about where we are going and what we want to do. And above all, Mr. Speaker -- yes, above all -- let us not be afraid to tell the people of the province what the problems are. That is where I must most certainly quarrel with our government at Ottawa. There is still a doubt, an unwillingness, a reluctance, in fact I might say cowardice about telling the people what they are to expect, about telling the people what their job is. My hope would be that the government of Ontario

would take a different course and show the utmost frankness, the utmost realism, about telling our people in our province what our jobs will be and what we have to expect in the days that lie ahead. That is the kind of leadership they merit.

I would like to see the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) repudiate this tradition that statesmanship consists in being adroit and expert in side-stepping issues. There has been too much of that in this country, and in this province. I would like to see the hon. Prime Minister show his stature by facing the issues,by speaking clearly and forcibly and by giving real leadership at the time when it is sadly needed.

There is one field in which we have failed miserably, in my view, and that is in the building of hospitals during the last four or five years. I can speak with feeling on this subject because in the constituency I have the honour to represent, this is a case of lost opportunities, giving all credit -- and a great deal of credit is due to those public-spirited citizens who have tried to provide a hospital for York Township, a municipality,Mr. Speaker, with a population practically equal to that of the Province of Prince Edward Island, one of the great municipalities of this province, the area in which, as my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) mentioned the other day, the electorate demonstrated interracial amity over one hundred years ago, was it not, by electing La Fontaine to Parliament, a part of York County in an area which today is an urban area with a large population, and which I am very proud to represent. This is a municipality with no hospital. There is a small, new hospital on its boundary, but this is a municipality which

has hitherto been entirely dependent on hospitals in the City of Toronto.

If the government had taken the initiative in this matter of building hospitals, a hospital could have been built there, hospitals could have been built elsewhere, hospitals could have been completed elsewhere during the years between 1946 and 1950 when material shortages were not as great as they are today, when labor shortages were not as great as they are today. But the job has not been done, because we are still relying on local effort, on voluntary effort, which is to be welcomed and to which I give full credit, but which is not adequate to the needs of the situation. Today, shortly after the municipality has voted in favour of a three quarters of a million grant for the building of a hospital in that large municipality, I understand the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is prepared to do as well for the building of that hospital. But to be quite realistic about it, Mr. Speaker, we all know it is going to be very difficult in 1951 or 1952 to get the materials and labour necessary to build that hospital. What could have been done with relative ease two or three years ago can only be done with great difficulty this year or next year. I do not think the government deserves too much credit for what it has done in regard to hospitals. Here again, people are grateful for small crumbs. The hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) is invited to the opening of new hospitals and gratitude is expressed to the Province for its grants -- which amount to, what? They amount in most cases to $1,000 per bed, and the Federal grant amounts to, I think, the same thing, in a day when it costs about $10,000 to $12,000 a bed to build a hospital. That is a very modest contribution

now for a government which in Ontario has accumulated surpluses of over $75,000,000 in three years' time.

I said that we welcome local and voluntary effort, I think it is the lifeblood of our democracy. But, Mr. Speaker, it is unfair to expect too much of public-spirited citizens acting in a voluntary way. They have a great part to play in our democracy, a great contribution to make, but is is unfair to expect of them what should be the responsibility of government.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And that brings me to this question of civil defence. Here again, as I pointed out recently as clearly as I could, we have lacked a clear lead from Ottawa and so far we have lacked a very clear lead from the Province of Ontario. I invite the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) or the appropriate minister to tell this House most specifically whether we are going to rely on local volunatary effort or give that clear lead which will summon from the people the necessary effort to build an effective civil defence organization in Ontario. And that clear lead will have to be very clear indeed, Mr. Speaker, because large numbers of people have come to the conclusion, with some doubt, that in the absence of a clear lead from Ottawa and in the absence of a clear lead from Queen's Park, there is probably no serious need for a civil defence organization and we might as well forget the whole thing. I do not think the hon. Prime Minster (Mr. Frost) or the hon Provinicial Secretary (Mr.Welsh) feels that we can safely forget the whole thing. I think they realize that a clear lead is needed and that the Provincial Government must accept a very large measure of responsibility.

I say again, Mr. Speaker, that we lookd forward to hearing from the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) or the appropriate minister, we invite them and we challenge them to speak as clearly and as fully as they know how about these matters, not only for my benefit or for the benefit of honourable members of this House but for the benefit of the people of the Province. They are entitled to know more about the Government's policy and intentions.

There are, Mr. Speaker, some conspicuous omissions in this Speech from the Throne, and I wish to refer to one or two of them. In all the Speech from the Throne, there is but one solitary paragraph on the important subject of education. What there is of itsounds more like an advertising blurb than the Speech from the Throne. It is a very boastful statement. It begins with the statement that:

> "In education, conditions are good and are improving."

and it ends by saying that:

> "Our people, dedicated asthey are to equality of opportunity, regard with satisfaction our progress in education not excelled anywhere."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is just about the nearest thing we have seen in this House to a man doing the very difficult job of patting himself on the back, shaking hands with himself and applauding himself, all at the same time.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Of course I know the hand is the hand of the Government, but the voice, of course, the voice can be none other than the voice of our part-time Minister of

Education (Mr. Porter).

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Now seriously, if there is one department in the Government of Ontario which demands the undivided attention and devotion of a man of capacity, understanding and experience it is the Department of Education.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: In all the discussions of this great and important question of education which I have heard in recent years, I have never yet heard a single attempt to justify or to defend the practice of having a part-time minister. It is a practice which has been followed ever since a Progressive-Conservative Government took office in 1943, and which, therefore, we must assume has become a fixed practice of the Government, At no time since '43 have I heard any person even attempt to suggest that it is good practice, no matter who the man may be, that it is good practice, or sound policy to have a part-time minister.

Now, if the Government has one little word to say in defence of that practice, let us hear it. Of course, for reasons which are well known the Government has had very little to say about education throughout seven and one-half years in office. Those were years in which great changes were taking place in Ontario, and education has been carried along on the waves of change and development. I say that there has been no evidence of conscious planning or direction, except, of course, for an ever-increasing centralization in administrative authority at Queen's Park, and, of course, that can always be done by anybody who

happens to hold the purse-strings. Of course, they can do that, they can centralize administrative authority whether they have any policy or not and whether they know anything about it or not; which has occurred.

On the rare occasionswhen the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) has ventured to make a policy statement as he did at the good old City of St. Thomas in 1949, for every answer he gave he created one hundred question marks, some of them very large question marks. There are still question marks on every side.

I think that of all members of the Government, the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) at least should be able to make himself clear, and I think our part-time minister has the merit that on occasion he is able to make himself clear, if not in connection with the Department of Education then perhaps in some other connection. The hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) of all people should be able to express at least a few ideas with clarity and precision. But first, of course, before you can do that, there must be a clear policy. If there is such a policy hidden away somewhere behind the scene unknown to the people of Ontario, then it is hight time, after seven and one-half years it is high time that it was unveiled and brought out into the light of day. Whatever excuses there may have been in times gone by for the Government's reticence about educational policy there are no excuses to-day. It was possible for a long time, I believe, for over six long years, to say that: "all these matters are under consideration by a Royal Commission". B ut that is no longer valid, if it ever was valid. The commission has reported and it is now more than ever necessary that the government should state its policy,

if it has one, and if it has no policy, if this subject is beyond the capacity of the Government, then let the Government say so.

I suggest that this being a democratic province, it is entitled to a most clear-cut explanation of policy at regular intervals and above all at this Session of the House.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not know of any department where that is more important than education, because in the field of education your aims and your objectives have the greatest significance and very large numbers of people are directly affected by the aims and objectives which you have chosen. Large numbers of people, including for example the school trustees and the school teachers, are surely entitled to know what the Government is attempting to do, as it makes mysterious changes from time to time inthe administration of the Department and all its agencies.

We have been kept in the dark much too long as to the Government's intentions. Now, and I suggest in this debate, let us have some light on the subject from the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) and from the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter).

I have no desire to single out for special mention the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter), a man for whom I have a high personal regard and who has my sympathy in the rash attempt he has made in recent years to carry two portfolios, but I am bound to refer now to our part-time Attorney-General (Mr. Porter).

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh,oh.

MR. MacLEOD: This is it.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): T his is the atomic bomb.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): You skated around the other one all right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Without taking up too much time on this subject, may I say if there is one other department in the Government that deserves the full-time attention of an able minister, it is the Department of the Attorney-General. And without going into details, Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Government that the conduct of our crown attorneys, indeed, the work of police commissions as well as the work of the Provincial Police andmany other agencies connected with the administration of justice are the responsibility of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter). If there has been a lack of capacity or a lack of zeal on the part of any of these servants of justice,then the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) must accept the responsibility. It is not enough to tell us, as we may be told, that he had no knowledge of what happened in a given instance. We have not yet abandoned the principle of ministerial responsibility, in this province, although the Department of the Attorney-General in times goneby has attempted it, but the principle of ministerial responsibility still holds, Mr. Speaker, and I think we are entitled to hear from the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter)-- not the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter. -

MR. PORTER: Wrong speech.

MR. JOLLIFFE: -- but from the hon, Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) a very clear statement of his policy and, above all, the clearest possible statement of the steps he has taken, or the steps he proposes to take, to reinforce and

strengthen the administration of justice in all the municipalities of this province.

I think the hon. Attornty-General (Mr. Porter) realizes that some explanation is due to the public, that no matter how much difficulty a commission like the Chochrane Commission my have encountered in getting at the facts, we are entitled to know from the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) that he is doing to assure that at all future times the facts will be readily available and that if any wrong has been done, the wrong-doer will be brought to justice. But of that we shall, no doubt, hear more in this session.

There is another minister who must also be a part-time minister because he is not in his place which I regret. There is another minister to whose department I must refer. This again is a minister for whom I have a high personal regard, although I have sometimes harboured doubts as to what he knows about what is going on in the empire he rules by remote control. He is not here to-day. I do not know why, unless he has gone to put out a

(Page C-14 follows)

forest fire.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, might I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) if he is referring to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott)?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am indeed.

MR. FROST: Well, I regret very much to say that the hon. Minister's (Mr. Scott) step-father died quite suddenly in Quebec.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I regret very much to hear it.

MR. FROST: And he has gone down to be with his mother, who is a very aged lady still alive in Buckingham, Quebec, and he regretted that he had to leave.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I regret, and I am sure that all hon. members of the House will regret his bereavement. I will not say anything here to-day that I would not say if he were sitting beside the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Blackwell), and I will, perhaps, say it to him on another occasion.

MR. LESLIE E. BLACKWELL (Eglinton): That would be better.

MR. JOLLIFFE: But what we want from the hon. minister (Mr. Scott) at this session is a very clear statement about his department and, in particular, I want to know from the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) one single point of any fundamental importance in which his administration differs from that of his predecessors. I know there have been many large claims made about reform and improvement in that empire known as Lands and Forests but what do they amount to? Our experience, Mr. Speaker, is that on examination they turn out to be 99% bluff.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Let me give a shining example thereof, for which the present hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) is not perhaps entirely responsible, but for which he must bear some responsibility. I give this only as an example, and to save time, and it will perhaps explain to the Government why we have so little faith in the glowing reports which appear from time to time about Lands and Forests.

In 1947, General Kennedy recommended, among other things, the appointment of an advisory committee, a committee advisory to the Department of Lands and Forests. With what result, Mr. Speaker?

Well, on the 9th day of April, 1948, nearly three years ago, Mr. Speaker, there was a Bill before this House for consideration. I am just going to recall to the House what was said about that bill by the hon. Prime Minister of that day, Mr. Drew. This was a Bill, Mr. Speaker, providing that "an advisory committee shall be appointed" --it was mandatory, it was not permissive, it was mandatory, and this is what the hon. Prime Minister of that day (Mr. Drew) had to say about that Bill, on the 9th of April, 1948, Hansard, Page 897, he said, referring to the Kennedy Report:

> "In the report by the Royal Commission there was a recommendation that the administration of the forest affairs of this Province should remain under Departmental administration, with the assistance of an advisory committee. The Government has accepted that recommendation, - "

the Government has accepted that recommendation, -

" - and the appointment of this advisory committee carries out the express terms of the recommendation in the report of the Royal Commission.

That is the sequence of events which brings us to the Bill which is now before us."

So that already on the 9th of April, 1948, Mr. Drew was boasting that that recommendation of the Royal Commission was being implemented.

He said further, at Page 8 98:

""We concur, however, in the recommendation in this case that the forest administration of this province should remain as a Government responsibility and that there should be this device for informing and advising the Government as to ways in which forest practices can be improved from time to time.

That is the purpose of this Bill, and the advisory committee which was set up will be a revision committee capable of examining the facts in relation to this tremendously important field of provincial activity and making proper recommendations from time to time through the Department which is responsible for the assets which remain a continuing property in the right of the people of Ontario."

He said also, referring to may friend the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson), at Page 899;

> "I think the hon. member (Mr. Robinson) by inquiring will find every major recommendation in that report will have been implemented either by decisions of policy under existing legislation or by the legislation which is now before this Legislature."

Well, there we have it, Mr. Speaker. On April 9th, 1948, Mr. Drew was claiming that the report of the Commission was implemented, at least as to the appointment of an advisory committee; by virtue of the passage of that Bill, Kennedy's proposal was being accepted and was becoming an accomplished fact. What actually happened? It was not until December 1st, 1950 that the Government released a statement announcing the appointment of an advisory committee. Do you wonder that we call this a Government of procrastination, a Government which takes credit unto itself in April, 1948 for accepting and implementing a written recommendation of the most specific kind and then on December 1st, 1950, over two and one-half years later, again takes credit unto itself for implementing the recommendation and appointing a committee?

And a gullible press, Mr. Speaker, fell for it, hook, line and sinker, and wrote glowing aditorials saying that:

> "Here is the proof of the sincerity of the Government in implementing the recommendations of the Kennedy commission,"

forgetting they had said exactly the same thing two and one-half years before.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is hardly to be wondered at that we call it a Government of procrastination and it is hardly to be wondered at that we are unable to take very seriously these fantastic claims that they have made about reform and improvement and change for the better in the Department of Lands and Forests. I have given only one example but it looks to us as though these statements are mostly bluff and we would welcome from the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) a very clear statement as to what, if anything, is the difference between his administration and the previous administrations which have squandered so much of the most valuable assets of this province. Let us have it, if there is any real difference.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(TAKE "D" FOLLOWS)

MR. JOLLIFFE (continuing): I know that some of the beneficiaries may be different, some of the contracts may have been re-written, and let us by all means have the particulars of those contracts and any respect in which they may be an improvement on former contracts. Let us have the fullest particulars about what may have been done for them by way of providing hydro-electric power, and at what price that power has been or is to be provided. Let us have from the government or the hon. minister (Mr. Scott) the fullest explanation of all that needs to be explained -- and that covers an empire of territory, too, in connection with the Department of Lands and Forests.

Mr. Speaker, to me the most surprising omission in the Speech from the Throne was in connection with agriculture. Now again I regret that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) is not with us today. I hope he is not unwell, but in any event what I have to say concerns, I suspect, the policy of the government as a whole, rather than the views of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) himself.

(Page D-2 follows)

I do not remember any Speech from the Throne in which agriculture received such curt and cursory treatment as the Speech from the Throne this year. We are told, Mr. Speaker, that further work is being done in connection with soils, stock improvement, pasture improvement and the like. This work, I might say with all respect, has been going on for quite some time now, in fact, for fifty years or more, so there is nothing very noteworthy in that - although we recognize that more money is being spent and it is probably a good investment. However, Mr. Speaker, there is not one word in the Speech from the Throne about legislation which would be of any value to the farmers of Ontario. This, to me, is all the more puzzling coming as it does at a time when more than any other year organized agriculture in this province is asking for specific amendments in agricultural legislation. It is public knowledge that the spokesmen of agriculture, the organized farmers of Ontario, have asked the government for changes in the Milk Control Act and for changes in the Farm Products Marketing Act and on this all-important question the Speech from the Throne was silent. I think we are certainly entitled to hear from the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), if not from the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) himself whether the government is rejecting the pleas of agriculture for improvement in that legislation. I might add that the Milk Control Act is of great import-

ance not only to the producer but to the consumer. It does not work satisfactorily. The Milk Control Act of 1948 is a failure from the point of view of the producers and from the point of view of the consumer. It had, I suppose, one merit from the government point of view, and thatis, it enabled the government to duck the responsibility for the sharp increase in the cost of milk to the consumer, but apart from that one merit from the government's point of view, there is general agreement among producers and consumers that it does not work and it will not work. Every province I know of, Mr. Speaker, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, with the possible exception of Newfoundland, has a different system of determining the price of milk to the consumer and the producer than Ontario, and Ontario alone has continued with Mr. Drew's ill-advised experiment of 1948 represented by the Act and the Regulations we now have. I might add that much of the difficulty in that Act is connected with the Regulations themselves and for the Regulations the Legislature has no responsibility, the government must bear the whole responsibility. To give only one example, the Regulation with respect to bonding, bonding distributors for the protection of the producer are inadequate. There are many loopholes in that particular system of bonding and it must be changed. I can say much the same of the Farm Products Marketing Act, it is no secret, it is public knowledge that this legislation is not working out as it was expected to work by the producer, it is not working

as well as the Farm Products Marketing Act of British Columbia which the government would do well to consider, which has been tried and tested with satisfactory results in the Province on the Pacific Coast.

May I add this, Mr. Speaker, I think it is about time the government made up its mind and told us what its policy is with respect to the further development and growth of co-operative organization in Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Because there is considerable doubt about it, the co-operators themselves are in grave doubt about the intentions or the policy of the government. There was a definite period in which the impression gained ground that the government desired to encourage co-operative growth and development, particularly co-operative marketing, and I think we all agree that the Farm Products Marketing Act represents a step forward and the schemes under the Act have been of real benefit to some of our producers in Ontario. But, apparently the point has arrived at which co-operative growth and development is a threat to the profits of the monpolistic position of some of our big processors, the time has come when they are beginning to apply pressure, and anti-co-operative lobbying is greater than it used to be with results which are beginning to tell on our co-operative organizations in Ontario. Only today, I understand, there was a test case which has been of great interest to many farmers

in Ontario. A great many dairy farmers are interested in the possibility of shipping to their market the co-operative way, of carrying their milk to the market by a co-operative truck. There was one experiment initiated in the Pickering area not too long ago which has been to this time substantially successful. A group of farmers formed and incorporated a co-operative shipping company and they have been allowed by the Milk Control Board, by the Joint Transport Committee in the Toronto market, and by the government to transport milk to Toronto for a limited number of members. Mr. Speaker, they are growing, so that they sought to add to their numbers, and it is at this point that their application to add to their members has been denied. It has been denied, I know, officially by action of the Milk Control Board but obviously by reason of the Automotive Transport Association and obviously because this co-operative method of transporting milk which was legally open to them when they incorporated is beginning to appear to be a threat to more powerful shipping agencies in the field. I say that this case, although it may appear to be a small case, is one of vital importance to shippers elsewhere, because if in this case this co-operative is to be stunted in its first two ears of growth because of pressure from the vested interests in the shipping business of this area, other farmers will be barred from taking the steps they proposed to the same end. I

think we are entitled to know what is the attitude of the government towards the denial of the right to expand which has been sought by the Pickering co-operative shippers.

I have given that only as an example, Mr. Speaker, of the urgent necessity that the government should make clear without any further delay whether it proposes to restrict further co-operative development in Ontario or encourage it. On that point, I think we ought to hear today from the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

There are others on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, who will speak about the government's apparent indifference to labor legislation as shown in the Speech from the Throne. We know of nothing forecast except possibly some amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act following the Roach Report and on that, of course, we should welcome as we always welcome a speech from the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley). Very important, too, we want to hear a very clear exposition of government policy. Of great interest to labor and many others is a Fair Employment Practices Act. Here again, Mr. Speaker, we cannot very well endorse a Bill we have not seen, but we do welcome the acceptance of that principle by the government and I have no hesitation in commending the government for its somewhat belated acceptance of that principle.

Mr. Speaker, I have been referring in the last few minutes to our agricultural producers and to labor

in this province. I referred also to lands and forests whence comes the livelihood of so many people in Ontario. I have one more matter to which I must refer before I conclude today and that is that great service without which the farmers of Ontario cannot successfully produce, without which labor in Ontario would be unemployed, without which we could not utilize the products of the forests, I refer to the Hydro-Electric Power Commission. What I have to say today about the Hydro is not intended to be particularly contentious, but I do suggest two things to the government. First, that the Hydro has become such a large organization, it is transacting business on such a tremendous scale that there is a danger it may become too remote from our people, a very real danger that it may be come a colossus to which no man can have access. Now, I know the Chairman, some hon. members of this House, and certain officers of the Commission, have on occasion tried to overcome that difficulty. I know, for instance, a great many form letters have gone out from "Bob" Saunders' office but, Mr. Speaker, it requires more than form letters written in a personal way to keep in touch with the people of Ontario. Some of the disputes in which Hydro have become involved in recent months suggest very strongly there is something missing in contact between the Hydro and the people who are so proud of this great institution. There is something to be done and that some of the reasons I have urged upon the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) as a first step, estab-

lishing of a committee in this House.

The other matter is of great long term importance as I think the government will eventually recognize if they have not recognized it already. The government forecasts an enormous growth in this province in population, in industry, and I am inclined to think that in the days in which we live a prolonged period of growth is to be expected. Now, Mr. Speaker, that growth will become checked at the most critical point unless Hydro's capacity to serve this province is very greatly enlarged within the next seven or eight years. The Chairman himself has recognized the fact that by 1956 or 1957 and possibly sooner more new supplies of power must be available and even after making allowance for the plants which have been completed within the last two or three years and even making allowance for the new development on the Niagara River, I think it is time everybody in this House recognized that unless the St. Lawrence Development is brought to a head by 1956 or 1957 we are going to have problems of major magnitude in Ontario, indeed, our further growth and development will be choked off. And it is very likely to become unbalanced at the very time when we need further development. May I say to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) I do not know and I do not think he has yet taken the House into his confidence entirely about negotiations which have taken place between his government, the government of Canada, the government of the State of New York

and his knowledge of the negotiations which have taken place with the government of the United States. I know that this matter is now before the Congress of the United States and there are forecasts that at long last the Congress of the United States may overcome the selfish objections which have so long obstructed the commencement of the St. Lawrence Seaway. But, Mr. Speaker, the time has come when this province and the Dominion of Canada have got to recognize that this is our last chance. If the Seaway is not approved by Congress this year it is never going to be approved by Congress. If it cannot be done this year with the endorsement and support it has received this year, not only from the President but from Mr. Wilson and numerous others in the best position to know what this Continent needs, if it is n t done this year it is not going to be approved by Congress at any time, in my opinion. I think we should hear from the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) what his intentions are. Is he prepared to urge upon the Government of Canada that the future life of this province depends on the St. Lawrence Seaway to the extent that Canada and this province should undertake this development, if necessary, alone, should the efforts this year at Washington fail to bring success. Here again I say to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), take the people into your confidence, take the Legislature into your confidence, tell the people of Ontario just what is involved in this problem. He knows how serious it is, let him tell the people what is involved, what the dangers

are, what the cost is going to be, what sacrifices we may be called upon to make and let him be as frank as I know he can be when he is so minded.

I want to be understood correctly, Mr. Speaker, I hope as I am sure we all do, that the Seaway will be developed by mutual co-operation between two great and friendly neighbors. That is my hope, but I think, after thirty years, we have some reason to take a firm position. Surely the time has come when we must not allow ourselves to be pushed around any longer. Mr. Speaker, there are people all over Ontario and all over Canada who are sick unto death of seeing this country and this province regarded and treated even by the friendliest neighbor as an industrial colony, as a satellite.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think it is time if necessary we struck out on our own with a project of this kind and if that should be necessary, who knows, it may be a good thing for our American neighbors as well as ourselves to learn some of the facts of life in regard to our capacities here in Canada.

SOME hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Finally, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has on occasion, on many occasions suggested that we in the Opposition are more interested in persuading him to spend more money that we are in reducing the provincial expenditure and then rather he gloomily refers to it as a sign of the times. I think he often looks

back with some nostalgia on the good old days when most issues in the Legislature related to the wise or unwise expenditure of $93.68. Well, there are larger issues in the forefront today, Mr. Speaker. May I say to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that he should be under no misapprehension about our position. We do not favor the spending of money as an end in itself, we are interested in the methods and in the selections which are made by any government, must be made by any government when it comes to the appropriation of funds. We are most keenly interested in making certain that the Provincial funds are expended in the matter best calculated to promote the public interests and we shall, therefore, find fault with him more often on the basis of the choice which has been made rather than on the basis that not enough money has been spent. I do not think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has heard or will hear many complaints from us that not enough money has been spent. We will take occasion to demonstrate that. In some respects money has been spent unnecessarily and unwisely and I am sure after all he said he will welcome every suggestion and every criticism of that kind.

Now before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I run the risk of making myself highly unpopular by assuming an older role. Mr. Speaker, I propose to give a word of fatherly advice to may friends opposite, in fact, two words of fatherly advice. My first word to them is that at the

last Session and again at this Session we have been somewhat disturbed by the appearance of the hon. members opposite. We seem to detect a spirit of gloom.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Indeed, it was most noticeable on Monday of this week when we faced approximately forty-five very long faces. I would say to the hon. members opposite a word of advice. Cheer up, do not look so glum. If a division is called, don't come into the House looking as though your tail, if you had one, was between your legs, come into the House cheerfully and enter into the spirit of the procedure in the customary manner.

(Take E follows)

Hon. GEORGE H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs) You set us an example.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is what I like to see.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: In former sessions,we have looked with a great deal of pleasure on the smile of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) but I think now he is smiling almost for the first time this Session, and we want to see more of it.

MR. DUNBAR: How could I, during the last hour and a half?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Notwithstanding the gravity of the world situation, let us try to be cheerful and even though their burdens may be heavy, let the hon. Ministers set a good example to their followers, and be as happy and smiling as is possible.

My second word of advice to them is to address themselves to at least some of the issues I have raised to-day. I have spoken in this House on a number of occasions, and repeatedly I have raised point after point after point, assuming that the hon. Ministers were capable of using a pencil, and their education was sufficient to enable them to make notes of what I said. But time and time again they have failed or refused or feared to deal with the points which have been raised, and have indulged only in what I would call "Polly Anna" speeches about how wonderful things have been in Ontario since 1943, or they have wandered off on another path and attempted to make ill-chosen quips about some of the other groups in this House.

I address myself to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). The Prime Minister is a man of very considerable capacity -

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And we have watched with interest his growth in capacity and stature since the days when he set over here on this side of the House.

The hon. PRIME MINISTER (Mr. Frost) is to follow me to-day, and we will listen with interest to what he will have to say.

May I say again - assuming unto myself the role of fatherly adviser - that I appeal to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to rise to the occasion and rise to the stature he has attained, by making an intelligible and reasoned statement on the policy of his Government.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I appeal to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) on this day of all days not to lower himself to the level of a cheap politician by side-stepping these issues or by indulging in an effort to discredit any of the hon. members of this House. In particular, let him show that he is a Prime Minister in the best sense of the word by dealing with the issues, and certainly not by making sport -

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): What issues?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: You would not understand.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, if the part-time Minister of Education and the part-time Attorney-General had not been a part-time listener to my speech - -

MR. PORTER: A full-time listener.

MR. JOLLIFFE: - he woild be enabled to grasp the fact that there are serious issues.

My suggestion to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) made in the best of good faith, is that he live up to his reputation as a Prime Minister, and make a speech to-day about the issues, and refrain from any petty attempt to make sport of the little band of hard-pressed men who sit on our immediate left.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: After all, the quality of mercy is not strained. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has on occasion shown he is capable of making a speech, and I hope we will hear a speech from him to-day, and while he is making a speech, he might perhaps give his consideration to accepting an amendment which I now propose to move to the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

"Moved by myself, Mr. Speaker, seconded by Miss MacPhail, that the motion for an address in reply to the speech by the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor before the House be amended by adding thereto, the following words:

"But this House regrets:

(1) That the Government has failed to hold a Provincial-Municipal Conference, or to recognize the urgent need for relief of Municipal taxpayers;

(2) That the Government has failed to forecast any improvement in agricultural marketing legislation;

(3) That the Government has failed to disclose any plan to remedy the breakdown of the Dominion-Provincial Housing Program;

(4) That the Government has failed to reverse the prodigal practices of previous administrations during the past quarter-century in wastefully alienating the natural resources of Ontario."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to congratulate the mover and seconder on their very fine addresses of yesterday. We expected from these two able hon. members - one from the great riding of Kenora up in the north-western corner of our province, and the other from down in the south-westerly corner, the hon. Member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) - very fine addresses and we were not disappointed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in rising I must admit that I do so in a sense of disappointment. I had expected when I sat here last Thursday afternoon and heard the words of the Speech from the Throne from the mouth of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor that after years and years we should at last have a complete commendation from the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), that he would say that there was everything in the speech which should be, and that to-day he would be commending the Government for the fine program which was outlined by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor here last Thursday.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it does make me somewhat depressed, after all these years, after striving and working to please the Opposition, to bring them up to a level where they can see the great work which has been done in this province, to have my hopes dashed to-day, and at the conclusion of the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), to have an amendment moved which certainly does not compliment the Government, and I feel a keen sense of disappointment that such should be the case.

However, Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavour to do my

best to bring the Opposition out of the gloom in which they have lived for many years.

They have referred to the fact that my Ministers are too gloomy. I do not know why that should be. When you win a division by 55 to 22, that is not a matter of gloom; it is a matter of rejoicing, and I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) that undoubtedly it was the glasses through which he looked at the Government side which created the impression he expressed. Really, such a thing does not exist at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the advice given by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) at the end of his remarks. I am always glad to listen to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe); indeed, I am always glad to listen to all the members of the Opposition, to hear what they have to say, a there is always a great deal to learn from the speeches made by all the hon. members of this House.

We shall endeavour at all times to conduct the affairs of this Province on the highest plane, and we will endeavour to attract to us people of goodwill from all walks of life, and I hope at the close of this debate that my hon. friends opposite will all come over and vote with the Government. That may be too optimistic, but I have always been a believer in optimism.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have carefully noted here the several headings under which my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) has made his remarks in this House this afternoon.

Some of these will be dealt with with the hon.

Ministers concerned; some of them I shall refer to this afternoon. He referred to the important matter of Civil Defence. The hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) will be discussing that matter in the course of the next few days.

He mentioned the administration of justice.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) was very guarded in what he said about the administration of justice, and in that regard I perhaps should compliment him. I, myself, think there have been too many statements made in the Province - wild and unjustified statements - which were calculated to disturb and perhaps destroy the feeling of certain people in connection with the administration of justice. I think that is a bad thing. After all, I think that over the years - and even at the present time - the administration of justice is on a peculiarly high level, taking our Courts, our Judges, our Magistrates, our Lawyers, and our Police Officers into consideration. By and large, Mr. Speaker, they constitute a pretty fine section of our people, people of whom we should be very proud. There is a danger of creating too great a feeling of complacency on the part of our people. One must always, in this matter, be on his toes; one has to be alert to the fact that people perhaps become careless or become complacent in the enforcement of our laws. That is not a good thing. We always have to be, as I say, on our toes; we have to have our guard up in matters of that sort.

But I would like to pay a compliment to the enforcement agencies of this Province. The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter), the Government, and myself paid close

attention to a situation which existed in Windsor. We very carefully scrutinized the situation, and the fact is that I think that people might feel some satisfaction with what was disclosed down there which was, as I say, the work of people who meant well. There are some of those officials, who were there, who were removed from office, had been there for as long as 35 years. People cannot be in this City for 35 years performing their duties as they have performed, without performing a pretty fair job. The fact is, there was complacency, that is the best way you can sum up the situation there. It has since been corrected. But there was nothing in any sense disclosed which was really fundamentally wrong. That is the report which has been given to us. We know there was carelessness, there was complacency; there was probably in some cases certain ineptitude, but I would say that basically it was not dishonest, but of the nature I have described.

I would say to the hon. members opposite that anything they can do, anything any hon. member of this House can do, any assistance the public can give which will strengthen the administration of justice which will improve the responsibility of people for law and order, and the administration of our laws upon which so much depends, we shall be glad to have it, and we would be very glad, Mr. Speaker, to have the assistance of everyone in that regard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) mentioned the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott). It had been hoped that to-morrow the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) would be

speaking, but due to the fact that some of the hon. members opposite asked that this debate would not go beyond 6 o'clock to-night, it will be necessary, to postpone his address, which I am sure will be very informative, to all of you.

I shall have some comments in regard to that to make myself, and I shall have some comments in connection with the great field of agriculture.

At this time I would like to say something to you in connection with the matter of education which has always been in Ontario and in this House one of the great and important subjects.

I would like to refer, Mr. Speaker, to the work which has been done. I must admit that I was at a loss to understand my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) and his references to the fact that there has not been a statement of policy from this side. I think that last year his criticisms were directed to the fact that we were going too rapidly; in fact, I think that was the tenor of most of the criticisms from my hon. friends in this group to the left of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) to whom he has referred - that we were going too rapidly.

The fact of the matter is that in 1951, in looking back over the last half dozen years, we can see that we have made the greatest progress in education in the history of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make statements which cannot be supported; I do not want to refer to the rigors involved, but I say to my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) that a half dozen years ago, in 1944, we were wrestling with

$13,000,000 in the estimates for education, and last year, in 1950, we were wrestling with the sum of over $50,000,000, and that amount will be larger this year. That is a barometer of what the people of this Province are doing in that great field.

I would not want to stand here and take all the credit for the Government in what has been done. After all, we are leading public opinion for the people of the Province, and if the people of the Province did not support what has been done, it would not have been done, because our four and one-half millions of people have consented to our spending 25 cents of every cash dollar received, and because of that consent, we have spent that amount.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make mention of the report of the Royal Commission on Education, which has been tabled. It has been widely commented on in the press. Some may have been able to have read the report in its entirety. It is now available for the hon. members in mimeographed form, and will be printed shortly.

The Report involves the labour and consideration of 21 conscientious citizens over a period of approaching 6 years. It covers a very large field. In much of this field covered by the Commission there is agreement; in the remainder there is disagreement, extending to very sharp disagreement. In some cases, the differences extend to a number of points of view. In fact, it may almost be said that in some particular parts, the report is a statement of differences.

As I have said, in some points the Report is unanimous; in some, it is anything but unanimous. I would like to deal with these two things, but I shall first say

something about the parts of the Report which are not unanimous.

Amongst the Commissioners there was a very sharp disagreement, extending, in some cases, to a number of points of view. There was lack of unanimity. However, Mr. Speaker, in this assembly I think there might be no doubt the same lack of unanimity amongst the ninety hon. members here. There would also be a lack of unanimity in the reaction of our four and one-half million people. It has been said of Ontario that it is a wide, territorial expanse, and different points of view are and have been difficult to cover. That, Mr. Speaker, is quite true.

Let us now turn from the Report to what we and other Governments over the generations have been doing back indeed, one hundred years. There we have the record of what has been learned, the practices which have grown up, and we have all the experience of men and governments over the period of our history.

It is true there have been differences of opinion, but, by and large, taking all the checks and balances, our people in this Province have been reasonably satisfied.

(TAKE "F" FOLLOWS)

In the Speech from the Throne there is a paragraph which I shall repeat:

"In education, conditions are good and are improving. School enrolments rose by twenty-seven thousand; new school accommodation was provided for thirty-six thousand at a cost of over thirty million dollars; the number of untrained teachers dropped to one and one-half per cent. of the total staff, and two hundred and eighty-seven more candidates than last year entered teacher training. School grants reached forty-two and a half million dollars and will be larger during the coming year. Grants are now distributed on a new plan which extends more aid for capital expenditures and avoids the sudden and drastic changes which formerly followed slight variations in assessment, population and school expenditure. General interest in education is widespread and deep-rooted. This is shown in the hundred odd communities active in the closer integration of elementary and secondary education, in the scores of schools experimenting in curriculum revision, in the unprecedented attendance of teachers at summer sessions, in the marked increase of Home and School membership, and in the constructive activity of teachers' federations and trustees' organizations. Our people, dedicated as they are to equality of

"opportunity, regard with satisfaction, our progress in education, not excelled anywhere."

That is a true and gratifying statement, and surely one which is a tribute to the genius of our people for sound government. It is quite true that what we have been doing is not perfect. On the other hand, we have been constantly striving for improvement over the years. We shall in the future strengthen, improve and better, with the object always in view of equality of opportunity. There is certainly nothing to indicate that a radical change now would enable us to do better than we are now doing and will continue to do. In the last half dozen years we can say with surety that we have made the greatest and most forward changes in education in all of our history. These changes include huge alterations to our grant systems raising the grants from about eight million dollars to over forty-two and a half million dollars this year. There have been changes in the curriculum, in the position of our teachers, in the accommodation of our pupils, in furthering the great cause of equality of opportunity. In doing all of these great reforms we have not created division among our people. We have been walking on the same side of the street and proceeding with amity in the certain knowledge that we have been making the greatest progress in our history. I am sure that this must make us all realize that the way of experience which we have been following and under which we have made such spectacular progress in recent years is the path to follow.

Concerning those parts of the Report which are very extensive and upon which there is unanimous agreement on the

part of the Commission, there are subjects which deserve the utmost consideration. Indeed, we should not permit those things in the Report upon which there are disagreements to obscure the very broad subjects upon which there are agreements. The recommendations and indeed the submissions upon which they are based should not be set aside. They include a multitude of suggestions which are worthy of consideration.

The accomplishment of these things, of course, will take time. The realities of the situation demand this. The great array of problems, including the security of our senior citizens, the higher cost of government, the impact of Federal Government taxation arising from national defence and other causes and the aftermath of war upon all of us must bring us to the realization that we cannot do everything at the same time. It must be remembered that there is a limit to the tax paying capacity of our citizens. We will, however, consider every proposal which will conform to the desires of our people, and give to the young people of this province the very best education and equality of opportunity that is possible anywhere.

A year ago I had the opportunity of telling the House on different occasions the position of the Government. The position of the Government then and now is simply this - that the Government in no way considers itself bound by the Report either in whole or in part, whether the recommendations are unanimous or not. The Report and everything in the same will have to be considered in the light of what the Government finds to be in the best interests of all our people. In no

sense has there been any delegation of policy to the Commission. Responsibility for policy must always remain in the elected representatives of the people. This is the position of the Government in relation to the Report and will so remain.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I should like now to depart to some other things, to speak a little bit more free.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: I listened the other night to a speech by my good old friend, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), who is sitting over there.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): You mean to say you listened?

MR. FROST: And Mr. Speaker, if I may use this word in the Legislature, his speech was really a "honey".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: In referring to this speech, Mr. Speaker, I should like to demonstrate the inconsistencies of that small group. Mr. hon. friend (Mr. Nixon) asked me really not to say anything about the small group there, but -

MR. NIXON: Go ahead.

MR. FROST: - my high regard for them and my high regard for the welfare of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) and the rest of them impels me to say something, because I would like to see them once more restored at least to some resemblance of the great party that they once were.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: In this speech by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) which was largely "cribbed" from another document which I have here -- a very remarkable document, published last November, "The Liberal Party in Ontario, Its Aims and Its Policies".

MR. NIXON: Which I assisted in framing.

MR. FROST: That is right. The wording of your speech is from this document, and, therefore, not only have we the platform but we have one of the authors right here. I am glad to have him here.

MR. W. DENNISON (St.David): What about the 21 points:

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, one of the statements is this:

> "Following a lengthy caucus of Liberal members of the Legislature last Thursday, Mr. Thompson released a statement that the Liberal Party was definitely not in favour of the Hope Report. We accept no responsibility whatever for the appointment of this Commission, nor the long years they were permitted to exist at great cost to the taxpayers, nor for the report finally presented."

There is apparently an error, that the party - apparently the Liberal Party was definitely not in favour of the Hope Report. Then it goes on to say this - you may recall this was delivered, I think, on the 22nd day of January, 1951.

MR. NIXON: Is my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) quoting

what I said? Because I didn't say that there.

MR. FROST: You said this:

"We accept no responsibility whatever for the appointment of this commission or for the long years they were permitted to exist at the cost of the taxpayer, or for their report finally presented."

MR. NIXON: That is right.

MR. FROST: Well, I heard my hon. friend (Mr. Nixon) say that, I turn now to this document. It is worthwhile reading, I commend it to the reading of anybody. This was the most remarkable political document that I have ever seen, filled by inconsistencies, evasions, equivocations and everything else, but they were definite at least in this:

"What the Liberal Party proposes immediately to do is set forth on the following pages."

That is in the pamphlet, much of which is in my hon. friend's (Mr. Nixon) speech. Then you have this:

"The Liberal Party deplores the failure of the Frost government to make public the report of the Royal Commission on Education."

Mr. Speaker, every hon. member of this House knows that report was released not an hour nor a day after it was received but it was released to the people of Ontario the instant it was received. I must admit we did that. I apologize to the press for that release but in view of the fact I knew that my hon. friends were stating we were holding up this report, of course I released it at once to the public.

Now we have:

> "The Liberal Party deplores their action in making drastic changes in the educational system before presenting the Commission's report."

In other words they deplore the fact that this Government went ahead and did the greatest things in education in the history of this province, awaiting a report which, almost the instant it is received, they repudiate and toss out the window. I make this statement to you, Mr. Speaker, that of the thirteen or fourteen hon. members over there, all of them have not yet read all the report which they now repudiate and about which they say in their platform they decry this government for going ahead with its great policies in the interests of our people while awaiting a report which they toss out the window the minute they get it. What a platform, what a platform.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Now, listen to this one. This is in heavy print:

> "The Liberal Party will - "

"Will", - and remember the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Nixon), they say they "take no responsibility for this Commission, they want nothing to do with its report, they do not even take the time to read it. They could not have read it because they only had one copy of the report and there are fourteen hon. members; I have only one copy and it has taken me pretty nearly all the time since the 20th of December to read it, so I do not know how the fourteen of them could read it, in fact I know, they could not. Nevertheless, they

say:

> "The Liberal Party will bring before the next session of the legislature the report of the Royal Commission on Education and give thorough consideration to the implementation of the recommendations therein contained."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I have not got very much time, I have only got thirty-five minutes because I want to let you out at six o'clock, but I have got a lot of things to cover.

I want to refer to my hon. friends over there. They have had a little change in status and organization in the last year. They have elected unto themselves a new leader. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), an old friend of mine, led his party for only a couple of years and then handed it over to someone else. The hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) led his party for less than two years and resigned on the 7th of September, 1949, with these words - and talking about gloom, Mr. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), these words are not very "bearish", is that not the word? Or "Bullish" -"bullish", that they use in the stock market?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: An innocent fellow like myself coming from down Lindsay way, is not familiar with those expressions.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: He said:

"When I accepted the leadership of the Ontario Liberal Party in May, 1947, I made the statement that I was not interested in leading an opposition party."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: No wonder he gave it up. The hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) is a pretty "foxy" individual. He really is.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: He is a man of great ability. I respect his ability, I have for years. I have admired him when he used to be over on the Opposition in just a little different coloured seat from the Liberals, and when he finally seized the opportunity of advancing along in the ranks of the Liberal Party -- and you can take his judgment as being pretty sound judgment --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: When he says he "doesn't want to lead an opposition party," that is why he got out and handed it to somebody else.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the new leader is not present in this house.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): He will be.

AN hon. MEMBER: He will be soon enough for you.

MR. FROST: I had thought that some one of them would have resigned his seat and allowed him to take his position here; not that we would like to lose any of our hon.

friends, as they are all nice fellows, but we would like to have the new hon. Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Thompson) in the House.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Do you extend an invitation?

MR. FROST: Well, it is not necessary, surely, for me to invite him here. He has got fourteen people here, I would think that would be the first thing which would be done.

May I say to you, Mr. Speaker, as one who has been in this House now for about fourteen years, during which period of time I suppose there have been sixteen or seventeen sessions, short and long, I must admit, sir, that every day I am in these buildings I am more impressed with the amount there is to learn about the business of our Province.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I find that every day that I am here, and I am sure my hon. friends opposite find it, too.

AN hon. MEMBER: Maybe they do not want you here.

MR. FROST: No, I never impute motives.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: May I say to my hon. friends that there is lots to learn of this province's business. I long ago found you cannot do it all with your left hand; you have to sit here and the longer you are here the more you learn, the more you find there is to learn. I am sure that my good friend the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) would agree with that, because he has been here for thirty-two years and in making this statement to you this afternoon, really I feel, when I see how necessary it is for somebody to be here to

hear the business of the Province discussed, how desirable it is for the leader of any great party or, indeed, any party to be here in this House, if he is genuinely interested in the affairs of this good old province. I look at my hon. friend the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) thirty-two years here, and when I read this speech of his, I think how much he has to learn after thirty-two years,-

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: -- about this province of ours. I suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Nixon) that he go down and discuss this with his leader (Mr. Thompson) and point out that if these errors can arise on the part of someone who has been here all these years, what about somebody who hasn't the opportunity of sitting in the House and listening to the discussions that take place.

MR. Speaker, my hon. friend (Mr. Nixon) ventured into the field of finance the other night in his speech which I listened to with great interest. He said that in the last year of his government in office they had spent $100,000,000 and he said: "these Tories spent $353,500,000.00".

MR. NIXON: I said you budgetted for that.

MR. FROST: Oh, no- well, all right, you infer that when we budget, we spend. Now, I willjust take these figures.

(TAKE "G" FOLLOWS)

Now, first of all there is a little inaccuracy in his own figures. He said they spent $100,000,000.00. That is not quite right. It should be $92,264,245.00. He is $8,000,000.00 out there. That is like my surplus of last year.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. G.E. PARK (Dovercourt): It was about $20,000,000.00 out.

MR. FROST: He said we spent $350,000,000.00.

MR. NIXON: I said you were budgeting for that in the current year.

MR. FROST: But you state here in 1943 $100,000,000.00 was taken from the taxpayers and so on; and you say:

> "After seven years of Tory government, -- and they seemed to be long years indeed to long suffering taxpayers, -- this is the picture the hon. Mr. Frost present to the House last Session. An expenditure of $353,500,000.00 or an increase of 350%."

Those are the figures and I am going to send the hon. member (Mr. Nixon) the auditors' report, because I took them out of that and it is well worth reading.

MR. NIXON: My reference was to the budget for the current year, it was in the Estimates of last year.

MR. FROST: You were pulling the wool over Old Man Ontario's eyes.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: The current budget was $206,000,000.00. Now, that is only $150,000,000.00 different from what he said, but what is that among friends?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Now, he referred to "debt" and he said that we were just increasing the debt, that we were the most reckless government that ever aat on these benches. Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. member (Mr. Nixon) if he will refer to the auditors' report I have given him he can see that in 1934, the net debt of this province, that is the one that really counts,was $358,000,000.00. In 1943 when they went out of office, it was $495,000,000.00, an increase of $136,000,000.00 in nine years, or at the rate, to get it down to smaller figures that little people like ourselves can understand, $15,000,000.00 a year, during the seven years this government was in office up to the last current year. We came in with a debt of $495,000,000.00; in 1950, after seven years in office under the most exacting and difficult circumstances, the debt was $508,000,000.00, an increase of only $13,000,000.00, or to get it down to smaller figures, an actual increase of less than $2,000,000.00 a year, whereas the hon. member's (Mr. Nixon) increase over there during their period in office was $15,000,000.00 a year.

MR. NIXON: How much did you increase it last year?

MR. FROST: I am giving the average, you have to look at this as a broad picture.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Never in the history of Old Ontario, in the last fifty years, since the turn of the century has any

government succeeded in keeping the net debt level the way this government has.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear.

MR. FROST: Now, to get to the real figures that we can understand. When we came into office the debt per capita in this province was $101.00. At the end of your term it was up to $123.00. That is what it was when we came in. Now, under the fine rule of this government over this period of seven or eight years it is down to $112.00. That is a totally different picture than the hon. member (Mr. Nixon) gave to the people of the Province of Ontario the other night. I would just like to draw these things to his attention.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) deplored the fact that we had, as he said, made no mention in the Speech from the Throne about the farmer. I would say this to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) there is a great deal in the Speech about the farmer. How about the matter of improving his telephone communications in this province ? The million or a million and a half farmers in this province were served by a patchwork service in this province and this government has said it is going to give to the farmers in this province a fair telephone communication, and when I say we are going to do it, we will do it. In a moment I will tell you some of the things we have done as evidence that when we say we are going to do a thing, we do it. I will say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that since this government came into iffice, we have snow-ploughed roads in this province far and wide so that it is

possible to have church units, it is a help to education; that it is possible for the farm men and women to get out to church on Sunday and go out to shop and live like ordinary human beings. I would say to you that one of the things we like is the extension and the betterment of communication services for our rural people and we are going to give that to them. I would like to tell the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) something about what we have done, some of the things that have been done by this government. In 1946 the hon. Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Challies) announced to this House a five-year plan to improve the lot of our farmers in this province. Some of the hon. members of this House laughed about that and said, "It is just another plan; at the end of five years nothing is done, it is so much window dressing. You are getting ready for the next election and this is window dressing and does not amount to anything." Mr. Speaker, I would like to give these figures. The hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies) stood up in this House in 1946 and said that in the next five years we were going to build 7,329 miles of line. Now, Mr. Speaker, have we done it? Today, in 1951 nearly five years after the words were out of his mouth, we have built, not 7,300 miles of line, but we have built 13,098 miles of lines.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Five years ago, at the same time, he said we would service 57,904 farmers and rural people of this province who were not getting the blessings of Hydro power. What is the record? We serviced, not 57,000 people, but 136,251 people.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I think the last year that the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) was in office they built 21 miles of line to service 2,000 families, and now in this great speech of his the other night he says, "We needa form of government resolved to bring you, the people of Ontario, the blessings of Liberal democracy."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Tell us about the rural Hydro rates.

MR. FROST: I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that the rural Hydro rates are lower than they were in 1940. Am I not right? Can the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) mention any commodity in this province which can show a record of that sort? These are interesting figures when we look at the need of our people, 156,000 were receiving Hydro at the commencement of the term of this government, the figure is now 293,000; 136,000 more. Taking an average of four to family, there are nearly one and a quarter million people who now have the blessings of electric light, and refrigeration and farm machinery which they did not have just six or seven short years ago. That is quite a record.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Speaker, may I rise to a question of personal privilege? The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has definitely challenged the figures which I gave and I have here the estimates for the current year which total according to his own figures $353,424,750, which is exactly the figure I gave.

MR. FROST: Yes, the hon. member (Mr. Nixon) is a very able man.

MR. NIXON: I am glad you discovered that.

MR. FROST: But you are not able enough to get away with that.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FORST: I would like to say this to the hon. member (Mr. Nixon), on his farm would he compare pigs and cows or pigs and sheep? Certainly, he would not and he knows full well, in this House, that he would not compare ordinary expenditures and capital expenditures and that is exactly what he is doing. He got out of the budget of 1943, the amount of the ordinary expenditures and he compares it with 1950 including our capital expenditures which cover the great undertakings of this government which have progressed so much under this great government.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NIXON: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) might at least concede that the figures I used were quoted exactly from his estimates.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I must hurry along because I have some other things to cover but I did rate the hon. member's (Mr. Nixon) intelligence higher than that. I would just like to continue on the matter of Hydro and I would like to tell you something that has been done by this government in these very serious and difficult days. You know, I am taken aback in this House when I stand here today and you new hon. members of this House would hardly believe this, that we have hon. members stand in this Legislature and talk about "unneeded power" and "unwanted power". But that happened. Not only did it happen once, but it has happened

over the years. We have the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) with a very forward look about this province warning this province that we are going to need more power. When we were under the rule of modern Liberal democracy we used to hear talk of unneeded power, of the fact that power was not needed in this province and that the people were being saddled by the contracts which had been arranged by a profligate government and that sort of thing. Why, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) mentioned this a few minutes ago; he asked me to take him into our confidence. I would be glad to do that. Time is going rapidly and I want to discuss other matters but I will cover that in the next few days. In those days, the Liberals had a great leader, Mr. King, one for whom I had a great deal of admiration and have had during the years. Mr. King wrote a very careful letter to these people here back in 1938 about the St. Lawrence Seaway.

(TAKE "H" FOLLOWS)

And at that time my hon. friends opposite sat on this side of the House, as supporters of the government and their leader wrote this letter to the hon. Prime Minister at Ottawa (Mr. King):

> "It is the responsibility of this administration and not yours, to provide the necessary power for our present and future requirements".

and then, going on to speak about the St. Lawrence, he said:

> "Irrespective of any propaganda or 'squeeze play' that might be concocted by you, you may rest assured that this Government will resist any effort to force us to expend public funds in such an unwarranted manner, or to foist upon the people of Ontario an additional burden of debt and taxation",

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will hurry along. As you know, we came into office in 1943. I think at that time the amount of our electrical resources ran about 2,000,000 horsepower. Since the end of the war, we have spent in this province -- and this is one of the things my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) was complaining about -- $406,000,000, and by this time next year we will probably have spent another $100,000,000. But in a comparatively short period of time we added to our electrical resources one and three-quarter millions horsepower, and we expect to be able to say that at the end of this year, 1951, since this government came into office in 1943, we have doubled every thing produced in this province since 1905.

In other words, taking the period from 1905 to 1943 -- thirty-eight years -- in the short space of time since the close of the war in 1945, up to the end of this year, we will be able to say we have doubled the development from 1905 to 1943.

Mr. Speaker, these are things which I know are of interest to my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe),because he raised those points in his speech. These are tremendous accomplishments.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Now, I will hasten along. He mentioned the Department of Lands and Forests. If the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) were here today, I would hesitate to go into this, but inasmuch as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has raised the point, I would not like to evade, in the time at my disposal, covering the point he has raised.

My hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) said: "Our Lands and Forests Departments has increased its expenditures from $4,000,000 under a Liberal government to $11,500,000 according to the last Public Accounts.

I think he is about right in that. The only thing is they did not spend $4,000,000; they only spent about $2,800,000 in their day --

MR. NIXON: No, that is not the point. I combined with that the Game and Fisheries Department in an effort to be absolutely fair.

MR. FROST: All right, I will take your figures. You show $4,000,000 under the Liberal government, increased to $11,500,000 according to the last Public Accounts the hon. members have been privileged to see.

And I think you said that of the net revenue of several million dollars received by the Conservative Government, the hon. Treasurer receives only $9,500. That means that in his day they spent $4,000,000 -- to use his figures -- although I do not think they spent that much -- and they turned over a large surplus to the province from the Department of Lands and Forests.

Under this government, we spent $11,500,000, and the poor old treasurer only got $9,500 to balance his budget.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, that, using my hon. friend's (Mr. Nixon) own words, they milked the Lands and Forests of this province, and did not spend in conservation, reforestation and forest management a penny of the money which they should have spent.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I would like to say to the hon. members of this House, that our forestry policy is very simple. We intend to give adequate protection to the great forests we now have and see that they are protected and maintained, and that the yield is sustained, and the growth is treated as a crop.

May I say to my hon. friends that we cannot correct this all overnight. We, in Ontario, have behind us 100 years of forestry production, good and bad, -- usually bad -- with all the mistakes and mismanagement of that time. We had in the speech yesterday some remarks about the mismanagement which took place prior to 1943, which I was glad to hear made, so the hon. members could get some idea of what took place.

I was interested in the appraisal which your own people made of that, because I think the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests at that time, under whose department this was handled, at a recent convention only succeeded in getting six votes which showed the level the Liberal themselves placed on the administration of the department during those years. We have set out, by research and management, to regain what has been lost, and to make the devastated areas more valuable to reproduce.

At the risk of repetition I would like to say, in hurrying along, what we have done:

Pulpwood concessions improperly granted cancelled;
15 million acres of forest returned to Crown.
Lake Sulphite bankruptcy cleared up.
Manufacturing conditions restored and export halted.
Abitibi Co. brought back to solvency.
Sturgeon Falls revived from a ghost town,
Espanola revived from a ghost town.
Enlargement at Kapuskasing.
New Towns- Red Rock - Marathan - Terrace (The Aguasabon power development).
Sustained yield program initiated.
Limitation of size of saw mills to 15 million feet per year.
Forest inventory by air and ground crew covering 153,174 square miles - the largest ever undertaken in the world.
Salvage operations - Mississagi fire - involving $4 or $5 million.

Dorset ranger school - the largest on the continent. A completely reorganized Game and Fisheries Division. Streamlined system of selling summer resort property. Largest air and general fire protection services in the world with 44 aircraft, 5,000 miles of telephone, 1,000 canoes, 300 motor boats, enlarged personnel.

MR. JOLLIFFE : Do not forget the Advisory Committee.

MR. FROST: All right, I will come to that if you will not be impatient.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we appointed a Committee representative of various interests in this country, including labour. What do the hon. members opposite say about our labour appointee? Was he not a good one?

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Who was he?

MR. FROST: You know who he is. My hon. friends opposite are strangely silent.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): There was a better man available.

MR. FROST: We put on several others, and we put on that Committee one man whom I hope will be the Chairman of the Committee, Major-General Howard Kennedy, - - -

MR. JOLLIFFE: Why did you not do that three years ago?

MR. FROST: The same procedure will apply to the Advisory Committee as applied to the Kennedy Report. We are going to take everything workable from this Report, and give to the people of this province the best forest management which can be given in the whole world.

The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) will

be speaking on that in the course of the next few days and I will not further elaborate on the matter.

I would like in closing -- and I have only a few minutes left, -- to get back to the "blessing of modern Liberal democracy", and quote an extract from the speech of my hon. friend, which is part of the great platform established last November, in which he said: "We will take the part of the poor and the weak."

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that when you hear my hon. friends talking about "taking the part of the poor and the weak", it gives me the opportunity of just reviewing part of the policy and achievements of this government, and I know it will do my hon. friend opposite good to hear these things which have been done since they left office only seven and one-half short years ago.

When they left office, there was no effective collective bargaining machinery in the Province of Ontario. Indeed, they had evaded and "shilly-shallied" on that for nine years until, in 1943, an Act was introduced involving the collective bargaining, where the judges sat with their gowns and tabs, and the lawyers were there, which was enough to scare the laboring man out of the place altogether.

I know that now you will see the fine labor legislation which is working and working so well in this province.

MR. NIXON: Do you not appoint judges to these Arbitration Boards now?

MR. FROST: Yes, but they do not wear gowns like the hon. Clerk of this House, and they do not scare the labor people right out of the place. When you are "taking the part

of the poor and weak", you do not recognize that point. Many time it is not what you do, as it is the way you do it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) if it is not true that the present government uses exactly the same officer in setting up their arbitration boards?

MR. FROST: You mean Professor Finkleman?

MR. MILLARD: Yes.

MR. FROST: Yes, and I have the greatest respect for Professor Finkleman.

MR. MILLARD: He has not the same confidence of labor.

MR. FROST: "That is not the way I heard it."

Now, Mr. Speaker, back in the days when the "poor and the weak" were looked after by this Liberal democracy, they had no holidays with pay, no Workmen's Compensation, the old age pensions only amounted to about $20.00 a month during the whole period of that government, up to the time they made a deathbed repentance in July, 1943.

There was no anti-discrimination legislation. I say to you hon. members opposite that it was quite right and proper in those days, and it was legal, when you are "taking the part of the poor and the weak", to put up signs like "Jewish patronage not solicited", and "No negroes need apply". These ghings happened, and these things have been abolished by this government.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I would say that despite the millions of dollars we handle, and have to handle, and which we are glad to handle in the interest of the people of this province,

still it is the human relationship which counts the most amongst our people.

I see I have only five minutes left to cover a brief subject. That is the matter of the Dominion-Provincial relations, but perhaps, after all the discussions which have taken place over the years, five minutes may satisfy the hon. members of this House.

I want to say that today the policy of "Old Man Ontario" and his government is no longer that Ontario is the milch cow of the Dominion. After all, this government is doing its utmost to play its part in bringing to our people in the province and to Canada the best Federal-Provincial relationship which can be obtained. We have not walked out of any conference, as was done by some hon. members --

MR. NIXON: No, I never walked out of any conference, that I know of.

MR. FROST: My hon. friend (Mr. Nixon) got the credit for it, and everybody thinks that, anyway.

MR. NIXON: What did Mr. Drew do? He just blew it up --

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that my hon. friends are going back to the "milch-cow" policy. I think it was either the hon. member for South-Grey (Mr. Oliver) or the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) who accused me of suggesting t at industry be turned away from Ontario toward the other provinces.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): No, I did not. That is one sin I did not commit.

MR. FROST: Then it must have been the other fellow. The other fellow said that I was suggesting that industry be turned from this province toward other provinces.

I wish my hon. friends could read what was said at the proceedings of the last Federal-Provincial Conference, where I did say this -- and I say it in the Legislature of Ontario:

> " What I have said makes evident the desirability of an even development of Canada. Large concentrations of industry in particular places in Ontario have created very large problems. A development of Canada with large concentrations in industry in particular provinces and little industry elsewhere creates like problems. Perhaps it would be well if this conference, as part of its work, would consider ways and means of providing for a more even industrial development across this country. It is very heartening indeed to see the expansion in the two far western provinces of British Columbia and Alberta. It is to be hoped that the other provinces may show a like development and we here should do everything possible to stimulate such development. The more even the development of this country, the better it is for all of us."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I think we have an over-concentration of industry in our larger centres, particularly in the Toronto area, and I can well imagine that the Mayor of Toronto, as well as ourselves, is glad to encourage industry to locate in smaller places. After all, the prosperity of Toronto depends upon the prosperity of this great province with its wide reaches. The prosperity of Old Ontario with four and one half million people depends on the prosperity of Canada. I hope they find oil in Saskatchewan, and I hope they find it in large measure in the Province of Manitoba, and I hope it attracts the people of Ontario there.

I hope the provinces in the East will prosper. We know the difficulties that Mr. Smallwood, the Premier of our tenth province, is facing because of the scarcity of industry in that province. We hope that industry will go to Newfoundland, and that it will help raise the standard of the people in that province, and they will prosper from industry. I hope the same thing will be true in Nova Scotia. I would like to see in this province the people burning more Nova Scotia coal, and I hope that matters will come about in the next few years to make that possible.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, the prosperity of Ontario is dependent upon the prosperity of Canada, and the policy of this government is not a "milch-cow policy", which we had for so many years during this "Liberal democracy", but that this will prove to be a new day, when the people will take a new view of these great problems.

Mr. Speaker, my time is up. I see it is 6 o'clock.

In fact, by the old grandfather's clock, it is three minutes after six. I must, therefore, close, and I hope my hon. friends opposite will change their minds, and if they do, will want to withdraw their amendment. After all, one can always change his mind. I did the other day in connection with an objection I made to three Bills. It is a good thing to change your mind when you feel that you are wrong. And I am sure the hon. members here would be glad to do the same. If my hon. friends would change their minds and withdraw the amendment, or if my hon. friends from the Liberal group would recant and bring in an amendment commending this government --

MR. OLIVER: Not while I am in my right senses.

MR. FROST: -- I know that we could join together with great unanimity and go forward to a greater and more prosperous Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, the speeches this afternoon, and particularly the one made by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) seem to call for some further comment, and in order to marshal my thoughts, I would ask you to declare it six o'clock, and I, therefore, move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.05 of the clock p.m.

- - - - - - - - -

ONTARIO

Third Session
of the
Twenty-Third Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

Toronto, Ontario, February 8, 1951, et seq.

Volume VI

Thursday, February 8, 1951.

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

Hon- (Rev.) M. C. Davies, Speaker

Volume VI

Thursday, February 8, 1951

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

MR. H.A. STEWART (Kingston), I beg leave to present the first report of the Committee on Standing Orders, and move its adoption.

TO the Honourable the Leglislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario:-

Gentlemen:

Your Standing Orders begs leave to present the following as its First Report:-

Your Committee has carefully examined the following Petitions and finds the Notices as published in each case sufficient:-

Petition of the Corporation of Niagara Falls, praying that an Act may pass ratifying an agreement with the Township of Stamford for the supply of water to the said Township.

Petition of the Corporation of Rideau Club, praying that an act may pass authorizing the Club to borrow money, issue bonds, etc., to the total of $250,000.00.

Petition of the Corporation of Barclays Trust Company of Canada, praying that an Act may pass enabling the said Corporation to carry on business in Ontario as a Trust Company only.

Petition of the Corporation of Wycliffe College, praying that an Act may pass enlarging the powers of the Corporation in the granting of degrees in theology.

Petition of the Corporation of the Jewish Congregation of Anshe-Sholom of Hamilton, praying that an Act may pass enlarging the powers of the Corporation to hold land and increasing the number of officers of the said Corporation.

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of Preston, praying that an Act may pass withdrawing the said Town from the County of Waterloo for municipal purposes.

Petition of the General Trust of Canada, of the City of Montreal, praying that an Act may pass permitting it to be registered under the provisions of the Trust and Loan Corporation Act, for the purpose of enabling it to transact only the business of a Trust Company in Ontario.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of St. Thomas, praying that an Act may pass annexing part of the Township of Yarmouth to the said City and for other purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Woodstock, praying that an Act may pass confirming an Order made by the Ontario Municipal Board on the 8th day of February, 1950, annexing part of the Township of East Oxford to the City of Woodstock.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Fort William, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the appointment of a Board of Directors for the Fort William Gardens.

Petition of A. S. Hodge, E. M. McMurray, et. al., praying that an Act may pass incorporating the Young Men's Christian Association of Greater Niagara.

Petition of Thomas Frederick Rawson, praying that an Act may pass ratifying a by-law of the City of Belleville granting the Petitioner a bus franchise in the said City.

Petition of the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Ottawa, praying that an Act may pass amending The Synod of the Diocese of Ottawa Act, 1936, so that the income from the Trust Fund thereby established shall be used for the benefit of the Bishop of the said Diocese.

Petition of the Corporation of the Township of East York, praying that an Act may pass increasing the number of members of the Council and prohibiting annexation of the said Township for a period of five years without the consent of the electors.

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of Hespeler, praying that an Act may pass withdrawing the Town from the County for municipal purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Oshawa, praying that an Act may pass confirming an annexation Order of the Ontario Municipal Board and for other purposes.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Toronto, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the renewal of an agreement with the Toronto Convention and Tourist Association and for other purposes.

Petition of the Trustees of the Police Village of Malton, praying that an Act may pass incorporating the Town of Malton.

Petition of the Corporation of Victoria University, praying that an Act may pass re-enacting its Act of Incorporation with certain amendments and exempting its land from taxation.

Petition of the Corporation of the Town of Elmira, praying that an Act may pass withdrawing the Town from the County of Waterloo from municipal purposes.

Petition of the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Ontario and the Rector of St. Thomas Church, Belleville, praying that an Act may pass authorizing the sale of certain land to the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.

Petition of the Corporation of the City of Hamilton praying that an Act may pass empowering the said Corporation to pass by-laws for smoke-control and for other purposes.

Petition of the Board of Governors of the Brockville General Hospital, praying that an Act may pass confirming the incorporation of the Hospital.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Report adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

HONOURABLE DANA PORTER (Attorney General): CHANGE OF NAME ACT

HONOURABLE DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend The Change of Name Act", and the same be now read a first time.

MR. R. THORNBURY (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, does this mean a change in The Progressive-Conservative Party's name?

MR. PORTER: Who asked that question?

AN hon. MEMBER: A Conservative.

AN hon. MEMBER: Another change?

MR. PORTER: This is not a time for questions.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: We do not need a change.

MR. G. E. PARK (Dovercourt): Except in the Department of Education.

MR. PORTER: Except however, the Liberal Party have apparently changed their name into--what was it? The Modern--?

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): --Liberal Democracy.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): You would not understand what that was.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. PORTER: Well, we admit we are somewhat at fault so far in connection----

MR. OLIVER: You would be.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): We appreciate that.

AN hon. MEMBER: Now could we have the Bill explained?

MR. PORTER: You asked for it. In recent years there were certain amendments to The Change of Name Act authorizing married women to apply under the Act, and it has been impossible in instances of applicants who became British subjects by marriage to comply with the requirement that formerly was in the Act, and still is, for the filing of a naturalization certificate. It is therefore amended to bring it into line with the necessities of the case to-day and where a woman becomes a British subject by marriage she does not need to comply with that requirement.

Further, the certificate now given under The Canadian Citizenship Act of Canada, which was passed in recent years, is not designated under The Change of Name Act

as a naturalization certificate. These amendments bring the Act into line with the present legal position so as to permit the use of either naturalization or citizenship certificates.

There is another amendment providing that where a British subject has become a bankrupt, evidence of that should be presented at the time of application for change of name.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to Amend The Board of Education Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. SPEAKER, this Bill provides that the representation of a County Council on a Municipal Board of Education shall be the same as under The High Schools Act, that is, at least one representative or three at the request of the Board.

And also provides that union Boards of Education, which can be formed only where the boundaries of a high school district and a public school section coincide be dissolved when the areas cease to coincide. It would be improper to permit the existing high school and public school board members to continue in office, as is now the case, where a normal dissolution is effected, because their jurisdictional area would be different.

Motion agreed to; first ready of the Bill.

THE CONTINUATION SCHOOLS ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to Amend The Continuation Schools Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. SPEAKER, this Bill provides a procedure where a high school district absorbs a continuation school district and a method of settling the disposition of the assets and liabilities of the continuation school. It also provides for the continuance of the continuation school board until all the assets, liabilities and property are disposed of.

It also provides clarification of the meaning of "course of study", this amendment to bring the definition in The Continuation Schools Act into line with The High Schools Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to Amend The Public Schools Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. SPEAKER, this Bill covers four separate amendments. First, it provides that debentures may be issued to take care of initial payments of contributions by a school board to a pension scheme. Pension schemes are now authorized for non-teaching employees.

Secondly, it strikes out certain words which authorized the Board to make contributions to a pension fund for teachers, officers, inspectors and employees. This is now obsolete under the provisions made under The Teachers' Superannuation Act, and also, as to officers and employees, this is covered by another section, 129. This is to strike out words which really amounted to a duplication.

Thirdly, it is proposed to make it permissible to a public school board or a board of education having jurisdiction in a Township or a portion of a Township which employs 100 teachers to appoint an inspector.

And fourthly, it provides that non-teaching employees of a school board may transfer to another board, municipality or the provincial or federal government without loss of pension benefits, in the same manner as teachers and municipal employees may do.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

(TAKE "B" FOLLOWS)

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend The Teachers Superannuation Act" and the same be now read a first time. Under The Teachers Superannuation Act as it now is teachers engaged in certain public institutions owned or subsidiary to the Department of Eduction are specifically covered under the Act. It is now proposed that the Ontario College of Art be brought within the scope of The Teachers Superannuation Act. Secondly, the scope of the present provision, a certain provision in the present Act is enlarged by the addition of schools for the children of the members of the armed forces and for the inmates of penal institutions, so that teachers in these schools may have the benefit of the Act. They may be transferred from the public system into these schools when they choose to do so. Another clause is altered so that hereafter it will permit transfers in the case of teachers who leave service in Ontario to become employed in the civil service of Canada who have done so since the first of April, 1949.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE FIRE DEPARTMENT ACT

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Frost, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend The Fire Department Act", and that the same be now read a first time. Mr. Speaker, this amendment covers one point only and is based upon a recommendation from the Fire-fighters Association

that the present maximum full time of work for municipal fire-fighters now seventy-two hours be reduced to fifty-six hours.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ACT

HON. W. GRIESINGER (Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Welsh, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend The Housing Development Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. G. E. PARK (Dovercourt): Will the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) give us an explanation?

MR. GRIESINGER: Yes, the amendment is to clarify the rights and powers of municipalities in relation to agreements entered into with the Province and with Central Housing and Mortgage.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE MENTAL HOSPITALS ACT

HON. M. PHILLIPS (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Foote, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend The Mental Hospitals Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David's): Will the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) give some explanation.

MR. PHILLIPS: This is to reimburse public hospitals for out-of-pocket expenses for indigent patients who are transferred from one of our Ontario Hospitals to a public hospital for any special treatment whether medical or surgical.

(page B-4 follows)

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

SANITORIA FOR CONSUMPTIVES ACT

HON. M. PHILLIPS (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I moved, seconded by Mr. Foote, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Sanitoria For Consumptives Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David's): Will the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) give some explanation?

MR. PHILLIPS: The amendment is designed to provide more effective control for tuberculosis by allowing a Medical Officer of Health to order examination of patients not only suspected of tuberculosis but it takes in contact and also patients who have been discharged from a sanatorium.

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) does this mean compulsory x-rays and so on?

MR. PHILLIPS: That is right.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

BOILER AND PRESSURE VESSELS ACT

HON. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labor) Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Goodfellow, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Boiler and Pressure Vessels Act, 1951", and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. A.A. McLEOD (Bellwoods): Who are you going to pressure now?

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): High Pressure.

MR. DALEY: This Act is a complete revision and consolidation of The Steam Boilers Act and Section 57 of The Factory and Shop Act. The first Steam Boiler Act was passed in the year 1910 and this Act was revised in the present revised statutes. With the technical advances made in this field and the present widespread use of boilers and pressure vessels it is necessary to bring the Act into line with present-day practices.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE OLD AGE PENSIONS ACT

Hon. W.A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Daley, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend The Old Age Pensions Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. W.H. TEMPLE (High Park): An explanation?

MR. GOODFELLOW: This is a very simple amendment, it simply provides for a municipal county the authority to more than one authority for taking of applications.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

HOMES FOR THE AGED ACT

HON. W.A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare); Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Daley, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Homes For the Aged Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. W.H. TEMPLE (High Park): Will the hon. Minister

(Mr. Goodfellow)explain, please?

MR. GOODFELLOW: There are only two amendments of any consequence. In the first place, an amendment to provide for the establishment in a district of a home by one or more municipalities. At the present time, the Act reads, "a district shall establish a home". Under this amendment it will provide for more than one home in a district.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew's): It will not cover the legislature, will it?

MR. GOODFELLOW: It might. The second amendment deals with capital grants for construction, that the Department will no longer contribute toward a capital grant towards construction of farm buildings and in the maintenance it will no longer participate in farming operations in the homes for the aged. We feel that we should only participate in the operation of an institution and not be engaged in agriculture.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS ACT

HON. W.A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Daley, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Charitable Institutions Act", and that the same be now read a first time. This would provide for a capital payment of $1,000.00 be paid towards due construction of charitable institutions.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

CITY OF NIAGARA FALLS

MR. W.L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Walker, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Niagara Falls", and that the same be now read first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT

MR. W.L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Walker, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Highway Improvement Act", and that the same be now read a first time.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew's): Would the hon. Member (Mr. Houck) care to explain the last Bill.

(Page B-8 follows)

MR. HOOK: Mr. Speaker, this is just changing the Act we passed in the last legislature Session, section 93 of that pertaining to the 600 foot frontage along the highways and also for the protection of the fruit stand. I think it is one of the finest pieces of tidying up legislation that has ever been presented to this house.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

YOUNGMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF GREATER NIAGARA

MR. W.L. HOPE (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Walker, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Youngmen's Christian Association of Greater Niagara", and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

TOWN OF ELMIRA

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Calder, that move be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Town of Elmira", and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

TOWNSHIP OF EAST YORK

MRSS. A. MACPHAIL(York East): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Millard, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Township of

East York", and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

TOWN OF HESPELER

MR. T. H. ISLEY (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Robinson, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act respecting the Town of Hespeler", and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

BROCKVILLE GENERAL HOSPITAL

MR. H.A. REYNOLDS (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Pringle, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Brockville General Hospital", and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

TOWN OF PRESTON

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Calder, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Town of Preston", and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

GENERAL TRUST OF CANADA

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Calder, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the General Trust of Canada", and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

HOME OWNERS PROTECTION ACT

MR. G.B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Fell, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled ,"The Home Owners Protection Act,1957", and that the same be now read a first time.

MR.R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Will the hon. member (Mr. Ellis) explain that Bill?

MR. ELLIS: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to provide relief for mortgagers and purchasers of farms and dwellings who have suffered substantial impairment of income owing to illness or other causes beyond their control or a dependant of such persons. Any such person who make application before a Judge for a stay of proceedings taken under a mortgage or an agreement to purchase upon such terms as the Judge may see fit. In other words, Mr. Speaker, this Bill is designed to protect the wholesale confiscation of homes and private properties such as occurred during the early 1930's.

Motion agreed to.

BARCLAY's TRUST COMPANY OF CANADA

MR. J. B. MacPHEE (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr.Blackwell,I move, seconded by Mr. MacDonald, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act Respecting Barclay's Trust Company of Canada", and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

RIDEAU CLUB

MR. D.H. LORD (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Naulitt, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the Rideau Club", and that the same be now read in first reading.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

WHITE CLIFF COLLEGE

MR. W. MURDOCK (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Thomas, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting White Cliff College", and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

CITY OF ST. THOMAS

Mr. F.S. THOMAS (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Patrick, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of St. Thomas", and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

CITY OF WOODSTOCK

MR. S.L. HALL (Halton): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Dent, I move, seconded by myself that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the City of Woodstock", and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to table the answers to two of the questions, No. 44 and No. 1. I point out to the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that this

is the sixth day of the session and I do not think in our history the answers have come in so quickly as today.

Now, in connection with answer No. 1 which relates to Hansard. In 1949, the cost of Hansard was $47,811.00. Last year, due to the action of this House and the cooperation of the hon. members, the cost was only $17,394.00 effecting a saving of $30,000.00 for the tax payers of Ontario.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): And we got more for it.

MR. H.C. NIXON (Brant): What you got was worth nothing.

(TAKE "C" FOLLOWS)

Last year, due to the action of this House and the cooperation of the members the cost was only $17,394, effecting a saving of $30,000 of the money of the taxpayers of the Province of Ontario.

MR. H.C. NIXON (Brant): What you got was worth nothing.

Hon. C. ARTHUR WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I table at this time the Forty-Ninth Annual Report of the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission for the year ended December 31, 1949; and the Report of the Statistics Branch, Department of Agriculture, Ontario, for the year 1949.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 1.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 1, "Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech from the hon. the Lieutenant-Governor of the Opening of the Session".

MR. F.R. OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, in this the first general debate in this Session of the Legislature, I want, first of all, to pay my respect to you and your high office. We are glad, indeed, to have you back presiding over the deliberations of this Assembly in another Session. I want to say, also, that the mover and the seconder of the address made rather good speeches. I may deal with some of the subject matter in the speech of my hon. friend from Kenora (Mr. White) before I have concluded my remarks this afternoon.

My hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve)

spoke and one can quarrel but little with the contents of his speech and I appreciate very much the difficulties under which he labors. It is not surprising that he found in the government's record something that they could be congratulated on from his point of view.

I think it is very pleasing, Mr. Speaker, to all members, when these relatively new members express themselves on the floor of the House if we are to have the full measure of democracy in the Legislature and in the province as a whole that members on both sides of the House should seize opportunities to present their views to the Legislature and through the Legislature to the Province of Ontario.

I want to come down to the two speeches which were made in the House yesterday, made by two very eminent legal members of the Legislature.

You know, when I was a young man many years ago my father thought that maybe I should go through for law. Circumstances which were beyond my control put me behind the plow instead of in the law school. Down through the years I have regretted, to a degree, my inability to take the law course, but, after listening yesterday to my two learned friends parade their legal artistry before this Legislature I am not so sure that I have not been blessed by my inability to become a lawyer.

I was very much impressed, from certain angles, by the speech of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). I do not think there is very much in it to which I can take exception. He was not at all nasty with the government this time. I do not know whether that is part of a plan or whether it just happened that way but I

noticed several times yesterday his face with an angry look on it, over here, and it looked as if something with dynamite in it was coming, but, by the time it got across the floor, he had it wrapped in so many saving words that there was not much of a bang to it. It may be, as I say, that that is part of a well defined plan that will unfold itself as the days grow into one another in this Legislature.

There is one thing that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) did say to which I want to draw attention. I think it is of great importance that we should consider the possible ramifications of this part of his address. He was talking about the development of the St. Lawrence River and in the course of his remarks he expressed his opinion that if there could not be an agreement consummated between the Dominion and the United States, that the Dominion on its own should proceed to develop the power on the St. Lawrence River. Now, I was intrigued and very interested in that portion of the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and I do hope -- and I say this sincerely -- that he will seize an early opportunity to enlarge upon that statement. It may be that because of my layman's status I did not properly assess the picture, but, to me, from that vantage point I have, or the position I have, it is difficult to ascertain just how that proposal is a practical one. It if is a practical one at this time, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) could convince the members of the House that it is practical, then it should certainly engage the serious consideration of the members of the

Legislature.

While I am on the question of the seaway I want to say to my hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that I am leaving him alone for a while, except for this remark. He read a letter that he got from the musty pages of long, long ago, purporting to say that the government of Ontario, which was then a Liberal government, was opposed to the development of the St. Lawrence River. Well, of course, he knows that there were ramifications and there were conditions that were attendant at that time which he did not divulge to the Legislature; but the thing I want to make clear, not only to my hon. friend, because it is clear to him, I am sure, but to the hon. members of the House and to the province generally, is that in 1941 the then Liberal Government of the Province of Ontario did consummate an agreement with the Dominion of Canada for the development of the St. Lawrence River. So that, the Liberal party in this Province is behind the development of the St. Lawrence River. Let no one mistake that. We recognize it as a potential asset particularly in wartime, and we are with the rest of the hon. members and the rest of the groups in the Legislature urging and hoping that this is the time when an agreement will be consummated between all the contracting parties. I agree with my hon. friend in this one instance that it does seem from the information that we can gather that now is the opportunity and if this opportunity goes past it may be decades before again there will be an opportunity, a chance of doing the thing that seems so reasonable to do at the present time. I wanted to make that clear, Mr. Speaker, so that

there would be no doubt in the mind of any one in this province that the Liberal party in Ontario is behind fully the development of the St. Lawrence River at the present time in conjunction with the Dominion and the United States Governments.

There is one thing, in regard of the speech of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), to which I must take exception, and I do it in a kindly fashion because, after all, I am a kindly man. I am also a pacifist, I guess, in politics; in other things I would not want to be labelled that at all. I do not like to hurt other peoples feelings. I do not mind having my own hurt. That is a remarkable mixture and yet that is just about what the situation is.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) speaking yesterday, said, as indicated on page C-3 of Hansard: "Surely the government, " referring to my friends across the way, "is not awaiting a lead from a government which seldom ever gives a lead about anything until the eleventh hour, or later."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: Now, my hon. friends can pound the desks at that sort of statement if they like. I have not always agreed with the policy of the Dominion Government at Ottawa and I registered that difference of opinion in this Legislature from time to time, but I am not going to sit in this House, Mr. Speaker, and hear statements of that kind made about a government in Ottawa, a Liberal Government, which has carried this country through the last Great War,

and through the reconstruction period of peacetime, which then went to the country and was returned to office with the greatest majority ever given a government in the Dominion of Canada.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: And, my hon. friends over here, who say they never lead until at least the eleventh hour, had the opportunity in the last Federal election to present their case and say to the people "Turn out of office this terrible government and put in one that will meet more adequately the needs of the people." Now, the election is over. The smoke of battle has cleared away and the net result of the campaign of my hon. friends to the right is that they have one lonely Joe from the whole of the province of Ontario representing their part in the Dominion House of Commons.

In view of that, Mr. Speaker, I think it ill becomes the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) to say those words about the Dominion Government, particularly at the present time. It may be that in all things they do we do not agree. I think maybe I will say this afternoon something in which I am not in entire agreement with them, but I am going to say that on the whole and in the main they are giving good government and they did not earn the sort of remark made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe).

There is one more thing, with respect to the speech of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) did not give him any attention yesterday. I want to give him some this afternoon.

MISS A. MacPHAIL (York East): He is leader of

the Opposition.

MR. OLIVER: He is the hon. Leader of the Opposition, also the hon. member for York South; and there is no rule of which I know which prevents me from telling him that he is the member from York South.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) said yesterday, as he was concluding his remarks, "When you speak be easy on the Liberals." I want to say in that regard that that was advice we did not want him to give to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). We do not want our hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) to be easy on the Liberals.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): I am a kind man, too.

MR. OLIVER: With that smiling face, countenance of his, he is apt to be easy without one telling him to be easy. So, just let him pursue his own course. Let him say all the things he wants to about this group over here, and the more he says the better we like it. It will be our obligation, of course, to retort in kind, and it will be our duty to fight him in the open on the issues he has raised. But let him not hold anything back; let him come right out with all the ammunition he has and let him direct it in the future, as he directed it yesterday, over to this section of the Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), but not right now; I am not just in the humor to deal with some of the things he said yesterday. I want to proceed a while and generate, if I can, myself, into a proper condition where I can

adequately express myself in regard to some of the hon. Prime Minister's statements.

So, leaving him alone for a while, I want to deal with some of the things dealt with in the Speech from the Throne. You know, these Tory speeches from the Throne are becoming quite an event. Each one seems to be trying to outdo his predecessor -- and along too definite lines, saying less and keeping it very, very vague. I mean, there is nothing in the Speech from the Throne. We may get legislation; I do not know; but we did not find it in the Speech from the Throne. I want to discuss some things which may be in the Speech from the Throne and others which have engaged the mind of the public for the last year, since we last met in this Legislature. I want to deal, frist of all, with the question of Provincial-municipal relations. I say to the House this afternoon that it is not my intention to dwell at length on this subject. Last year I am sure that the House will recall I did at some length put the position as I saw it of the municipalities in their relationship with the Provincial Government before the Legislature and before the province; I did take the opportunity to make at least two radio addresses on this particular subject. I have not any regrets, because, to my way of thinking, Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest problems in the Province of Ontario today is the relationship or the lact of relationship, that exists between the province and the municipalities. I see by the press a month or so ago the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in meeting some delegates from the municipalities said to them that he appreciated their problem and that he was going to do something about it. Well, at

least that is progress.

There is a very difficult situation in regard to these municipalities and I think it is pretty well known at the present time throughout the length and breadth of the Province of Ontario. So, I am going to content myself this afternoon with saying to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that he should, even at this date, convene a provincial-municipal conference. I do not think the sort of conference that he mentioned when the Mayors and Reeve met him is one that will get at the bottom of this situation. He said to them, "Send your executives in. Come in from time to time and talk with me." That is not the sort of meeting at which this great problem can be solved. It is not the sort of meeting that can grapple with the immensity of the problem. The only properly constituted meeting of that kind that will do any good is, as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) knows, a properly called and a properly conducted meeting at which the representatives from the municipalities, will sit down with the government as equals, as partners and they are able to say one to the other, "This is our problem and we want to see it solved and the situation corrected." I think we could, at a provincial-municipal conference, do some very good work. I do not think it would need to all relate to finances. True, I think one of the big stumbling blocks is finances. The income of the municipalities is more or less static and the expenses which they are obligated to pay are going up all the time. That creates, of course, an impossible situation for the municipalities. It is essential in this Province, yes, I say above everything else that we keep

sound and that we keep solid the position of the municipalities in the province of Ontario. It is very important that this government from their vantage point -- vantage point it is, I will agree -- should lend themselves and their finances in the readjustment of the grant system as between the provinces and the municipalities.

(TAKE "D" FOLLOWS)

I believe that at a meeting between the provinces and the municipalities the question of civil defence could be gone into. The arguments, pro and cons, could be brought out by the delegates, and by the government, and out of that conference on civil defence, would come, I am sure, a pattern which could be followed in the province of Ontario.

There are many other things which could be done at a provincial-municipal conference, and I believe there will be one called before very long, and I hope the government, even at this session of the Legislature, will give the assurance to this House and to the Province that they realize the gravity of the situation to the extent that they will convene a conference between the province and the municipalities.

I believe, too, that a conference between the province and the municipalities could well discuss the question my hon. friend, the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), raised yesterday with regard to the decentralization of industry.

I want to say to this House, in regard to this problem, that for many years I have argued in this Legislature that it would help the old fabric of the province of Ontario if we had what is called "decentralization of industry". If we could have some master plan, if we could have legitimate means of getting these industries to settle in the places out in the country, it would be very beneficial, and around those industries would be built up, not only a town, but there would be built up a farming section, and that farming section could sell its products to these local

communities. They would save on transportation, and it would help to build a community life and a community spirit, second to none.

I suggest to this House this afternoon that every-anything we can do toward the redistribution of industry, or the decentralization of industry, should be done, whether we are at peace or at war. But it is doubly important in time of war, because the centralization of industry in time of war presents a great target to those who seek to annihilate us -- to those who seek to do us wrong. But with industry so decentralized throughout Ontario, the target would be much less, and the chances of survival would be much greater indeed.

This House could do much less, I would say, than to get down to a discussion of the fundamentals of how this matter could be accomplished, because it is something which is very important and strikes at the very root of our future advancement as a Province. Because, Mr. Speaker, I think the trouble is that some of our great cities are already large enough. I think they know that themselves. The very largeness of the cities presents very great problems for the administration within that city, in good times or in bad times. I think it would help everybody, therefore, to have industries spread out in a more uniform way throughout the length and breadth of this province of Ontario.

There is no reason, with the present methods of transportation, why industry could not be built even up in northern Ontario, and what a boom and advantage it would be to that great norther empire of ours, where today, in many

sections, they have no place to sell their produce, and the community life is not what it should be, nor what it would be if we had larger centers of population, with our people working in factories in these communities, satisfied and contented, and willing to give all the assistance possible to aid in building up the community itself.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch upon another matter which enters into this problem to a degree, and it has to do with the Department of Highways.

I want to speak to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett), and present an argument with which I think he will at least partially agree.

It has to do with the relationship of counties and townships to the provincial road system. My friend, the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) will agree with this, that he has not been able to take over county roads into the provincial system for this last number of years. I am fair enough to appreciate that there is a problem, so far as the Department of Highways and the government is concerned, in that regard, but the problem you have, Mr. Minister (Mr. Doucett) is not as great as that which rest on the counties and townships. There is growing in the counties and townships a regular bottleneck of roads which is being held up by the inability of the Province to assume a portion of the county road systems. The time has surely come in this Province when the Government could go out on a program of adding a definite mileage of county roads to the present system each year. That would relieve, to a very great degree, the congestion and the taxation of the counties and municipalities in this Province.

I do not know where we will end unless something is done along that line, because, as the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) appreciates, the townships keep wanting to put the roads on the county, and the county gets to the place where they have more than they can handle, and the Province will not take any over.

I suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) that we should have a plan and program of absorning into the provincial system a certain definite mileage of county roads each and every year.

And I want to say this to the hon, Minister (Mr. Doucett) as well -- and I think perhaps he will know what is coming in this regard.,This has to do with the cost of snow ploughing.

The day has come in Ontario when the Department of Highways should pay for the snow-ploughing of county roads. It is not a fair "shake", as they say. The way it is done at the present time, and it is most unfair, even to the untrained eye, to those counties -- and there are a number of them -- which lie in the snow belt of the Province of Ontario. There you find the situation where they have to pay one-half of the cost of ploughing winter roads, and that portion of their cost is very high in relation to other counties which have little or no snow.

I suggest to the government -- and I think it is a practical suggestion because after the counties get the roads ploughed then you take the eleven cent tax on your gasoline, and if you will figure it out, you will find that the eleven cent you get from the gasoline tax on roads

ploughed within the county will pay the fifty per cent you pay to the county --

Hon. G.H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): That is ridiculous.

MR. OLIVER: You will not lose any money at all. I think you should consider the taking over of the total cost of ploughing the county roads as far as snow is concerned.

This is one of the problems, and one which is very aggravating to a great many counties of the Province of Ontario.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for a moment or two about the agricultural industry in the Province. I would say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, -- and in a general way --, there is a growing amongst the farmers of Ontario that this Government is failing the industry of agriculture. I want to enumerate some points to substantiate that broad statement.

The Federation of Agriculture have asked time and time again that there should be very definite amendments made to the Farm Products Control Act, and with their suggestion and with their stand, I am in entire agreement.

I remember when the Farms Products Control Act was placed on the statute books of this Province, and in those days it was a good Act; at that it met the requirements of the agricultural industry, but as time has gone on, difficulties have arisen, new methods of marketing have been brought into being, and it is only reasonable that the Farms Products Control Act, which served the

people of Ontario ten years ago, no longer adequately serves the farmers of the province of Ontario. It is of record that the Federation of Agriculture has asked for these changes, but they have not been forthcoming.

I would say to the House, and to the Government, that the time has come for a thorough over-hauling of the Farms Products Control Act. There are new conditions arising; the farmers are getting more organized throughout the Province, and as they increase and perfect their organization, new conditions arise which are not covered by the provisions of this Act.

So the Government has been waiting; they have been putting off the day when they should amend that Act, and I say the day is right here, at the present time.

There was a suggestion made in this Chamber -- and I agree with it -- that this Government is sort of getting away from its support of the principles of cooperation. We had an example in the House yesterday, where a number of farmers wanted to transport their own milk, and when they came to the Milk Control Board to have another two or three farmers put on the list, they were turned down by the Board.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, we have not come to the place in this Province when a group of farmers who band themselves together to improve their own economic status, are going to be denied in any way, shape or form, the legislative enactments which will allow them to proceed along an orderly course.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: I say to this House -- and I say to this Government -- that there must be a revision, of thinking in regard to the Government's attitude towards the whole principle of cooperative marketing.

I am one who has grown up -- as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) probably knows -- from the field of cooperative endeavour of various kinds, and I say to this House this afternoon that no government in this enlightened day and age, can afford to put any stumbling block whatever in the path of the onward march of the cooperative principles of this province of Ontario. Because, after all is said and done, the farmers and people who practice the cooperation do not ask much from the Government. All they ask from the Government is that it does not stop the farmers doing any legitimate thing they want to do by some legislation which is on the statute books. But, on the other hand, they should enable the farmers to proceed along a normal course by the best legislation complementary to their needs.

There needs to be a revision of thinking on the part of the Government in regard to the whole problem.

I am one of those who believe -- and I do not mind saying it in the House -- that cooperation, and the practice of cooperation and the cooperative principle is applicable to every legitimate business in the province of Ontario, and I do believe, Mr. Speaker, with all my heart and soul, that the practice of cooperative principles in this Province is a deterrent to the monopolistic control of the industry in this Province, and if we ever

get to a place in this Country where Government has to take over industry because the vested interests grow too heavy on the shoulders of our people, -- I hope, when that day arrives, it will be the people themselves, by their own initiative who will pursue that course to its legitimate end. I hope it will not be necessary. I would not like to see the Government take over business of any kind.

It is a different matter entirely when people organized for a specific purpose, and with a definite goal in view, and when they march forward with right on their side, there is no reason that we should put anything in their path which would cause them to falter and stumble for a moment. I say that sincerely to this House this afternoon.

There is another point with regard to marketing upon which I would like to elaborate for a moment or two, and that has to do with the Milk Control Act.

Back in nineteen hundred and something, -- I think it was 1947 -- the Government brought in a very far-reaching amendment to the Milk Control Act. That was t the conclusion of the Report by the Dalton Wells Commission on Milk.

The effect of these amendments brought in by the hon. Minister of Agriculture at that time (Mr. Kennedy) was to remove the entire price-setting features from the Milk Control Act.

Now, Dalton Wells, in his report of the Commission on Milk -- if there was one thing he stressed above everything else, it was this, that if there was any doubt at all as to the authority of the Milk Control Board to set

prices for fluid milk, that doubt should be removed once and for all. He did not mention th t in his report only once, but a number of times. He wanted the Legislature to make sure that there was ample authority within the Milk Control Board to set prices to the consumer and to the producer.

With that report on their desks, the Government of the day went exactly in the opposite direction, as they have a peculiar habit of doing. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) stood up, and he asked the House to concur in deleting all the price-setting features of the Milk Control Act, and leaving it up to arbitration between the producer and the distributor.

The consumer was not being considered, I imagine, in any great degree at all.

I spoke in the House that afternoon, and I told the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) just exactly what would happen, and it has happened. I said to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy), "The plan you are evolving here this afternoon of a negotiation and arbitration will lend itself to endless arguing, which will go on for a period of time distasteful to the producer and the distributor", and I implored the Government two or three years ago to put back into the Milk Control Act the features which allowed that Board to have jurisdiction over the setting of the price of milk.

I say this afternoon, to this House, that if we do that, we will provide more stability in the whole milk marketing in the province of Ontario --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: -- because the day has come when for

the protection of the consumer, the Board should have the right to set the price of milk; it should have the right to say what that price will be in the light of all the circumstances; it should have the right to analyse and go into all the features of the problem, and come up with a price which will be fair to the producer and to the consumer.

I suggest to this House that the time has long been passed, when we should have put back into the Act that which would give to the Board the right to set the price of milk.

May I say in a lighter vein, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) who went after the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) yesterday -- and I say that I felt very badly about that because he is not able to take care of himself very well, not being an experienced member of the Legislature.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: But his discussion wandered around to the labour relations court, which was set up by a former Liberal Government, in 1943. I think Judge Gillanders was picked to preside over that Court. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said they did not like a Court, because this Judge wore a gown, and so forth. I do not know whether he wore a gown or not, but my recollection is that he did not. However, I do not think that is very important at the moment.

But what I am going to say to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is this: that he was terribly upset about a Judge acting as Chairman of the Labour Relation

Court, but he does not seem to mind that the Chairman of the Milk Control Board is another Judge. If it is proper for a Judge to be Chairman of the Milk Control Board, then it is just as proper to have one as Chairman of the Labour Relation Court. I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) must have forgotten that in the course of his remarks.

I want to say something along another line just for a minute, which has to do with the report of the Conservation Committee.

(TAKE "E" FOLLOWS)

I think I am speaking the mind of every hon. member of this House when I say that that was a good report that was presented to the House last year. And I would say further that I know of nothing that has stirred the interests of the people generally in the matter of conservation as much as the activities of this committee and the presentation of the report itself. We had---and still have if we snatch it quickly --- a grand opportunity to capitalize upon the enthusiasm of the public in the Province of Ontario in regard to conservation practises.

But now we come back to the Legislature a year later and there is no indication that the government is proceeding to implement the basic principles of the conservation report. I would say to the House and to the province that that is a tragedy, because the recommendations of that report generally were for the building up of what is Ontario, what is basic in Ontario---the farm lands, giving leadership to farmers in new methods and making it possible for us to make good land out of land that is not so good today.

I agree that there were several features of the Act that had not to do with the Ontario land, and I notice that a few weeks ago one of them was given practical demonstration when the Dominion and the province and the municipalities together did some work on the Thames River, I believe it was. There is a great field, I am persuaded, a great field of expansion along the line of Dominion-Provincial relations in regard to conservation practices, not only in regard to dams but in regard to forests and in regard to reclaiming land that is almost lost, and I urge the government this afternoon from really a patriotic standpoint to do everything that lies within their power along two lines:

To stir up interest between themselves and the Dominion to see that these great problems are attacked and solved; to give the recommendations of this report that had to do with the Agricultural College at Guelph, that had to do with the building up of farm lands in the Province of Ontario and that had to do with a dozen other things that are so important to the very life blood of the province, to give them their attention while they can. It may be that they will not have long to consider them, but let it be said that as you went out the door you had on your lips---

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: ---a desire and a determination to put into effect some of these recommendations in the report of the Conservation Committee.

Then there has been some suggestion that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) did a good job at Ottawa in regard to social legislation as between the province and the Dominion. I think it is gratifying to the Province of Ontario that we are sometime to have an agreement in regard to pensioners over 70 and those between the ages of 65 and 70, but so far as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and his part in this matter is concerned, I do not think that he will argue with me when I say that there was really no other course open to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) but to agree in regard to this plan. The thing I want to bring out in this regard is this, having to do with old age pensions in the province: I do not know, and I do not suppose the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) can tell just when this plan will actually be consummated. I do not think this great, rich province of Ontario need wait for the final consummation of that plan. We have in this province resources enough, we have

money enough to do a job for these elderly people on our own,--

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: --until such time as there is an agreement completed between the province and the Dominion of Canada. I urgently say to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) this afternoon that he knows as well as any of us that there is a need for greater pensions for our old people and that need can be met, temporarily, by the Province of Ontario stepping into the breach. And when one speaks about old age pensions and those who are recipients one must also, I think recall to the House that we have not in this province any satisfactory pension for a disabled or an incapacitated person.

AN.hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: Now I hope that the day will come in Ontario when we will have a pension of that character, and I do think this present government should do everything to inagurate, to initiate such a pension plan, because I think we are all agreed it will not be very long until the plan as a whole will be consummated on a Dominion-Provincial basis, and it willbe a great thing for the Province of Ontario to have led the way in regard to this very important matter.

I want to say just a word or two before I conclude about the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) remarks yesterday. I do not know when I enjoyed a speech as much as I did that of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost).

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: He was in good form, still kept the smile with him all the time, which of course adds to his ability,

Now, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) started off by passing the time of the day with the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and saying a few more pleasantries, and then he turned his whole attention to this group here and hebegan firing with both barrels. I do not think there was anything but powder in them---

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: --but they were coming this way at any rate. He started off by saying that there had been a change in leadership over here, and he enumerated the number of years that each one of us has held this important post, and you would think to hear the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) talking that nothing like that ever happened in his family.

AN. hon. MEMBER: Oh, no.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: Well, I guess we all recall the triple play, Drew to Kennedy to Frost, so if the Tories are allowed to do it, surely the rest of us can follow suit--not because the Tories did it, mind you, but because basically and after due consideration we felt it was the best thing to do.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD: (Bellwoods): A change is as good as a rest.

MR. OLIVER: That is right.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: And after some months had passed, I am more sure in my own mind today that it was the right thing to do than I was when the ceremony took place.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Then you were not so sure?

MR. OLIBER: I say that to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) with complete confidence that he agrees pretty much with me, although He did say yesterday that it was a shamethat the leader of the Liberal Party (Mr.Thomson) was not in the House. I do not think that came from his heart. I think he would rather have me here than the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Thomson) in the province. He just had to say something along that line, and that is what he said. Now I would suggest to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that if the leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Thomson) wants to come into the House, you need not lift a finger, a way will be found. He will be here, there is no question about that, in the course of time.

AN hon. MEMBERS: A long time.

MR. OLIVER: You yourself by an action between yourself and the hon. the Lieutenant-Governor will set the time pretty well.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: So that part you have almost entirely in your own hands. Now, if you feel that the leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Thomson) should be in the House to take part in the discussions, if you think he has been criticizing your party too much, there is an avenue left open to you. You can send some of those fellows along the front fow out into the country to answer this man. Send that double man, the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) and the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) out.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: And I will give my promise to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), Mr. Speaker, that in some way we will arrange a small meeting for him.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: We will do that if you undertake to send him out into the country. There has been almost a dearth of speaking in the country on the part of the Cabinet Ministers.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Lots of travelling.

MR. OLIVER: Well, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) opens fairs, and smiles, and I think he is doing a pretty good job along that line, but the other hon. Ministers do not bestir themselves too much. So this presents a grand opportunity to have these latent talents developed and allow them to express themselves and present their point of view, so that so far as defending the government is concerned, there is all kinds of avenues open to them if they want to do it.

Now then, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) yesterday took to task my hon. friend the member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), and I just want to say two or three things about those remarks and I want to be very definite on one of them, so that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the whole province well know what I think about this particular item. It had to do with his remarks concerning the Department of Lands and Forests. Now the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frsot) criticized the former Liberal government for only spending less than $4,000,000 on the forests of this province and he was aghast when it was suggested that maybe this great heritage should return something to the provincial exchequer. In those days, which were altogether different days than we are living in now, the economic conditions in the late 30's were not to be compared, as every hon. member knows, with those which prevail at the present time, that expenditure of $4,000,000 by the then government on the forests of this

province was a considerable sum. And I seem to recall, Mr. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that in those days when you sat over here, there was a leader at that time by the name of Mr. Drew, and one of the first things that he did after he got his chair warmed was to move for a 25% reduction in the expenditures under the Department of Lands and Forests, and if the records are looked up, I would not be at all surprised if we would find Mr. Frost's name among those who supported the move for a 25% reduction in Lands and Forests estimates.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: And yet my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) yesterday felt that it was a very miserable, a small sum to spend to care for and to propagate the forests of the Province of Ontario.

I want to make myself abundantly clear on this matter. I agree entirely with my hon. friend the member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and my opinions are at variance with those of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) when he says that all we should expect from that vast empire up there is that we should break even in regard to revenue, That is an unusual statement. Why, when times are poor, or bad, bad as they were in the 30's, that is a sould argument, but in these days when the price of pulp was never higher and when the price of lumber is very, very high indeed, surely we have a right to expect from that great heritage that it will return to the exchequer of this province a reasonable amount by way of a surplus.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: I put myself in that regard very plainly

before the House this afternoon, because it is to me a regrettable thing that we should have it go abroad that we have the greatest heritage of any country in the world, and all we expect to do is break even. Why, I look forward to the day when, under proper management, that great North country will return to the consolidated revenue fund of this province very large amounts indeed, and at the same time be cared for as it should be properly cared for as an asset.

And then I would say to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that toward the end of his speech he got into the question of a certain report called the Hope---Hope---Hope---yes, the Hope Report. He read carefully from a manuscript the government's position in regard to this report and what I gathered was this, that they did not think there was anything in it that they would legislate upon, but they were going to have still another look at it and if they found anything it would be brought before the legislature. Well, I guess that is about the position all round, except that we say we have studied the report and that it does not as a whole commend itself to the people of Ontario.

Now, this half million dollar baby that was left on the doorstep of my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) might as well be put in the wastepaper basket now as later, because you have no intention of implementing it and neither have we.

You know, when I think of that report, I think of a song that has been made rather acceptable this last few months. Tho is that fellow that sings it, Harry?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): "Goodnight Irene"?

MR. OLIVER: Now, I never knew what her name was before. Irene.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: No, I was going to say that this song that Phil Harris, in my opinion, has made famous --- maybe others have made it more famous than he has, perhaps people like them better, but I like the way he does it.

This fellow in the song goes down to the beach and he finds a big box and he trys to pawn it off on his friends, and goes into certain places of business and tries to give it to them. He takes it home and his wife puts him out the door, and he doesn't know what to do with it. Now, there has been a great controversy throughout the country as to what this thing,is, so I suggest in the House this afternoon you can call off the hounds, the chase is over, "The Thing" is the Hope Report.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: I do not know any better solution. I think it meets all the requirements -- all the requirements.

But let me say seriously to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), when he started reading this pamphlet that constains some of the things that the Liberal Party intends to do, may I just say to him that I hope he does not stop on the inside page, I mean study, really put some study on it, because it is a collection of --

MR. FROST: Gems.

MR. OLIVER: Well, yes, gems,I would go that far. I did not want for the moment to be that enthusiastic.

MR. FROST: Since I learned my hon. Friend (Mr. Nixon) had a hand in writing it, I am more enthusiastic than ever. I have read it through several times and it is a remarkable document.

MR.H.C. NIXON (Brant): I agree with you.

MR. OLIVER: Then with that statement that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) just made, I need not argue the point any more except to say this, that when he read the item dealing with the Royal Commission's Report, it was suggested in there that it would be studied and the recommendations placed before the Legislature. Now I want to say to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that that report was studied by hon. members of this group. Before the speech of my friend the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) I found him studying so hard that I had to urge him to desist in the interests of health.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): That is why he looks so gloomy.

MR. OLIVER: Each one of us has given that Report a good deal of study. We understand its fundamental suggestions, and we say to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that we have given the Report all the consideration that the document deserves, and after having gone that far, we say not only to him but to this House and to this Province that we would not undertake to implement that Report.

There is nothing wrong about that, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) did not need to get so exercised, but then he had not much to get exercised about, so he just jumped on the little thing that he thought had something to it.

Mr. Speaker, there are some other things I wanted to say, but I did want to have the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) and the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr.Kennedy) present and there will be an opportunity when the estimates are presented to the House to do so, but I want to say in a general way that throughout the province today there is a feeling, and a growing feeling that the government has failed to give a square deal to the municipalities of the province. There is a growing feeling that they have not been fair to the agricultural industry of the province. There is a very real feeling that insofar as liquor control is concerned, that they have become a selling agency in this province and that all pretence of control has been thrown out the window. There is a growing apprehension on the part of the people of this province on many of these matters. In regard to labor---and my hon. friends to my right will agree with me on this---some of us put before the House last year certainamendments when the Labor Bill was going through. We thought those amendments were sound. We thought they coincided with the best interest of the labour people, and of the people of Ontario.

AN hon. MEMBER: Mr. Thomson does not.

MR. OLIVER: I do not care what you say about Mr. Thomson and his labour work. I would say this to you.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): You do not agree with him?

MR. OLIVER: I would say to my hon. friend (Mr. Dennison), and I want to be fair about it, I do not believe for one momentthat Walter Thomson has ever done or said anything that was derogatory to the cause of labour.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): He voted against union security last year.

MR. OLIVER: Just you keep quiet for a moment.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: And he did say something about the cause of labour, then he will have to revamp his way of thinking on that particular matter.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: So I say to him: "Look out", and to my hon. friend (Mr. Park) over here, I say that the Liberal Party, is today, as it has always been, the friend of labour and its legitimate aims in the Province of Ontario.

SOME hon.MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(TAKE "F" FOLLOWS)

Then, I want to say to the hon. members of the House, Mr. Speaker, that there will be an opportunity to speak further on these matters.

I have a piece of paper here and there is something written on it that I want now to read to you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Nixon, the following amendment to the amendment, that the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the honourable the Lieutenant-Governor now before the House be further amended by deleting clause 3 and 4 thereof and substituting therefor the following clauses:

3. That this government, without responsibility for the national defence, has failed to indicate any intention to act within the sphere of its own powers to overcome the added financial material difficulties that beset home building.

4. That the government has failed to reverse the prodigal practises of preceding Conservative administration.--

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER:--For the last seven and a half years in wastefully alienating the natural resources of the province. That is a natural one.

5. That the government has failed to disclose any plan to remedy the obvious defects in the Labor Relations Act (1950).

I want the House to get this, and adding thereto the following

clause:

> And this House begs to advise Your Honour that the government does not enjoy the confidence of the people of the Province of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, may I at the very outset of my remarks join with the speaker who preceded me in tendering to you my felicitations in the third year of your reign as Speaker of this Assembly. I am sure that I voice the sentiments of all hon. members of the House when I say that at no time in the history of the Leglislative Assembly of Ontario have we had a Speaker who has ruled with greater fairness and who has shown more consideration for the hon. members of the House.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: And I would add to that, Mr. Speaker, something which I am sure you yourself will agree, that in carrying your duties you are very ably assisted by your very charming wife, Mrs. Davies.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: Now, Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I want to say that I feel very much more secure since the uncrowned King of Aurora is sitting on my right. He was absent for a few days but he is back and we are glad to see him in such good condition. I hope when it comes time for him to be crowned that the Stone of Scone will have turned up and it will be under the Throne. I am sorry the hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Hanna) is not in his seat, he promised to be back so he could assist me and cheer me up if the going gets tough.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I, like other hon. members of this House listened with interest to the addresses delivered by the mover and the seconder of the motion before us. I might say that the hon. member from Kenora (Mr. White) was kind enough to warn me in advance that he had some material in the speech that would be aimed in our direction and so the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) and myself put on our asbestos vests just in case. However, I am frank to say that after he was finished I felt a sense of letdown because for a number of years when we sat in "self righteousness row" at the back, we were the recipients of heavy artillery fire at point blank range by Gunner George Drew. We really got it. However, the strange part of it is that we lived to see another day, we came back and he did not.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: And I want to say to the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. White) that there is just a possibility that that may have been the last opportunity he will have to fire any ammunition in this direction and you may regret that you did not say more when you had a chance.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: Now, as for my good friend the hon. member from the Highland constituency of Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve), he delivered a fine speech, a very fine speech.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: It was well delivered, very good material and he closed on a very fine note when he said that with tolerance and goodwill in this Chamber, in this province, in this nation and in the world there are no problems that

could not be solved. That was a very fine note in his speech and I would like to believe that contribution to his speech was made by his good wife, who happens to be a MacLeod.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: I of course congratulate the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the hon. Leader of the Government (Mr. Frost) and the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) on the weighty contributions that they have made to this debate and as I listened to them I wondered just how I should launch out. I happened to come across a couple of sentences that were spoken in the American Senate not long ago by a gentleman by the name of Senator Homer Capehart, who rose in his place as we must rise in our places and he said the following:

> "When I look about me, Mr. President, and see the intelligence displayed on the faces of the members of this Chamber and when I look at the members of the House of Representatives and see the intelligence displayed on their faces, and when I meet the officials of the Administration and see the intelligence displayed on their faces, when I look about me and see so much intelligence displayed, I wonder what after all, we are thinking about."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: Well, I am in much the same position myself. What now is there to say after that long sub amendment, the longest in the history of the Province of Ontario. It regrets about everything there is to regret and we shall

have to get our research department busy to see if there is something left to regret.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: Now, it has been my custom in years past to go down the line and to have something to say about everybody. I am here today prepared to say something about the Liberal Convention. I have a little package here wrapped up in the election prospectus of the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) which was the finest piece of literature delivered at that convention. I might say I was there.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Who did you vote for?

MR. MacLEOD: I was reading the papers and I wanted to make sure that the Liberal Convention chose wisely but not too well. I went down to look things over and I picked up all the literature. Here is one by Mr. Thompson done in two colours and here is one put out by "Hop-a-long Cassidy", the runner-up.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: And then I picked up two copies of the aims and policies and I have them here, I have in this package the 1945 prospectus of the Liberal Party, "Full Employment and Freedom from Depression". Then, last but not least there is the very attractive document. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this id deckle edged, just like the hon. member (Mr. Calder). It says here, "Cam Calder has the Combination". Well, I am bound to say that "Cam" may have had the combination, but Walter cracked the safe.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: And that may explain why the new leader having cracked the safe said in his acceptance speech, "Mr. Chairman, it would be better that I were on my knees than on my feet."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: Now, at the bottom of this folder it says, "Cam is forty years young with a good thirty more to go," and he was raised a Presbyterian. It is quite clear that he did not think of the doctrinal implications of the statement, "Forty years young with a good thirty more to go." You have forgotten your catechism. Then, it says, "Cam is the winner type. He always has been. He doesn't wait for opportunities---he invents them." Behold the man. He did not make it, of course, for it became a contest between "Hop-a-long Cassidy" and "Slip-along Catastrophe."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: It is too bad that the new leader is not here but as the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) has told us he will be here in the fullness of time and we can only hope that we will be privileged to be here when he arrives.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): I will be back in a moment.

MR. MacLEOD: Good. Do not tell him what I said, Well, the Liberal Party has a new leader now, and as I said on opening day, I hope he stays around for a while and I hope that the Liberal Party family will settle down to a serene and productive existence.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): A very pious wish.

MR. MacLEOD: Well, at least, it is a kindly wish. Now, I had something I wanted to say about the "Laird of Lindsay."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: A couple of years ago when I was in the back concessions I made a speech one night urging the government to do something about the home, the former home of the late William Lyon MacKenzie. I called attention to the fact that the home that was presented to Mr. MacKenzie, the first Mayor of Toronto and former member of this Assembly, was in ruins, was falling apart and I said that I thought it was proper that the government of Ontario recognizing the great contribution that Mr. MacKenzie had made to the establishment of representative government in this province, should do something to reclaim that home and put it in good condition, perhaps make it a museum where the young people of this province could go and become familiar with that great chapter in our history. I no sooner had sat down than the present hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) got up and said, "Well, this government is very anxious to preserve historic places but the hon. member's idea as to what places should be preserved and the people who should be thus honored are so grotesque that they do not even merit consideration." Now how do you think I felt when I was down in Nova Scotia in the month of May and Mrs. MacLeod was kind enough to send me a copu of the Toronto Daily Star of May 10 with a picture of the "Laird of Lindsay" sharing a pistol with the great-great-grandson of William Lyon MacKenzie. The story starts out as follows---before I read it I want to say that when I made the remark that William Lyon MacKenzie was one of the Fathers of

representative government in Canada the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said he never heard such nonsense in his life.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): They expelled him from this House.

MR. MacLEOD: Yes, the paper says, "An hour-long skirmish between troops and a handful of poorly trained rebels at Yonge and Eglinton 113 years ago was pictured yesterday by Premier Frost as the key event which brought not only responsible government to the Canada but served as the cornerstone of the British Commonwealth." So, the Star did not quote you right.

MR. FROST: I will send you a copy and you can read it. It is very well written, even if I did write it myself.

MR. MacLEOD: I was hoping the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) had a change of heart and when he pinch hitted for Mr. King down there, opening that place, I thought he really believed that William Lyon MacKenzie had made a great contribution to representative government and he was big enough to admit. Sir, I was rather interested after reading that story to pick up in another paper the following which represents the hindside. The date line is Boston, September 13,

> "The Massachusetts Leglislature has been asked to reverse the convictions of 21 persons hanged 257 years ago."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD:

> "The action would absolve 16 women and

five men accused of witchcraft in Salem in 1692. They were hanged between June and September of that year. Representative Daniel Rudsten filed the plea yesterday."

Well, I suppose we can say that these 21 people must have noted a lot of changes in Boston when they got back. It is rather interesting that at the time the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) was having a change of heart here and honoring William Lyon MacKenzie that the Legislature of Massachusetts should be giving a clean bill of health to the 21 people who were hanged 257 years ago. It makes us feel rather hopeful.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: There is a chance that 257 years from now the great-great-great grandson of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) may be saying kind things about us, who knows?

However, I do not want to leave the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) before adding just one more thing. I have a great deal of respect for the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), I really do, and, as a matter of fact, I do not think there is anybody in this House who is ashamed of the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Frost).

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: I think in many ways he is a credit to the province, he is a fine looking man, and an intelligent man. It just happens that a couple of nights ago I was doing some light reading and I came across a few words

that I think might go on the record today as representing our general opinion of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) when he behaves himself.

(TAKE "G" FOLLOWS"

This was written of another man. I will tell you who he is later. Now this is what it says: "No one could possibly object to it because he had all the arts of making himself pleasant at his tongue's tip. The soft answer that turneth away wrath, the deferential word, the flattering phrase, the interested query, the enthusiastic exclamation, the understanding nod, the look of appeal, the soulful glance, the tactful gesture and the kindly laugh all were perfectly timed and controlled by an art that was but partly conscious." Do you agree with that?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: I may say, Mr. Speaker, that those moving words were written by way of tribute to Sir Arthur Sullivan who wrote so many fine comic operas.

Now, to the Speech from the Throne: There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, but that the contribution made by the hon. leader of the government yesterday in replying to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) was an election speech.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: As a matter of fact, as I watched the members on the other side of the House as he warmed up to his subject I could perceive, shall I say, the slow beginnings of life over there for the first time since the Session began.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): The hand of doom is on them.

MR. MacLEOD: Yes. I do not think that the Hope Report was the boom, boom, boom; I think it was that speech yesterday. That is the thing which will set off a chain of reaction in this province and you watch and see just how

things proceed from here on. This is election year, and now that the hon. member from South Grey (Mr. Oliver) has challenged them how can such courageous men help but take up the challenge? So, I think it is coming and that we are going to have an election this Summer. It is with that in mind that we should consider the Speech from the Throne.

As I said to a meeting on Sunday night at which representatives from other parties spoke, and I may add that the Conservative Party was asked to send someone to participate in this forum, but they did not send anybody. The other three parties were there. I said then, in referring to the Speech from the Throne, that the best that could be said of it was that it is a very "allusive" document. Very "allusive." It alludes to almost every important issue facing the people of this province. All the words are there: "Housing", "Pension", "Rent Control", "Fair Employment Practises", etc. Not much elucidation. As I said on Sunday we are in the position where we have to say "For now we see through a glass darkly." We do not have the legislation. I rather imagine, Mr. Speaker, that we will get a terrible shock when we see "face to face". But we will wait and if it is good, well, we will all be for it; if it is inadequate we will try to improve it and if the government persists in keeping it less than adequate then we will have to vote against it. But, anything good that this government has ever done has always received warm commendation from all sides of the House and the government is in no position to say that the Opposition placed any obstacles in its way in

respect of anything that it really wanted to do.

I want to deal, for the next few moments, with the opening sentences of the speech. It begins by telling us that the "Province has continued to progress, that its industrial potential has expanded and has grown in large measure. The employment of our people is at a very high level. Our confidence in this growth has been vindicated and, indeed, I may say, established on a firm foundation." It goes on to say "Conditions have changed greatly in the past year. Much to our regret world events have had effects upon our lives which are of the gravest concern." Of course, with that we all agree. There has been quite a change. Last year I remember a number of speeches being made in this House asking this government to do something for the unemployed. We had a lot of unemployed young people coming up here. They were in the Prime Minister's office, they were down in the Committee Rooms and they were discussing their problems with the individual members of this House. They are not here this year. That is not to say that there are not people unemployed, because if you go down to the Scott Mission on Spadina Avenue at 12 o'clock every day you will see quite a lineup of people. There is some unemployment; but, by and large, there has been an improvement in that respect and it must be said that however much it may be regretted, the improvement in the economic situation in this Province is connected---is connected---with these changes which have taken place in the world.

In the past seven or eight months there has been

raging in Asia a war in which hundreds of thousands of people are engaged. I want to say a few words about it. A few days ago---on January 23, to be exact---the Toronto Daily Star carried a despatch by its Lake Success correspondent, Harold Greer. It is a report on the debate at Lake Success and on the efforts that were being made to end the war in Asia. I would like to call the attention of the House to this paragraph. "While the spark of peace in the Far East kindled into flames today the U.S. seemed to many nations to move with disturbing swiftness to snuff it out." What is the background of that quotation from Mr. Greer's despatch in the Toronto Star? Let me go back a year, Mr. Speaker, to the 17th of February, 1950. Today is the 8th of February, 1951. I hold in my hand a page from an important U. S. publication. It might be called, I think, a financial journal. In this article, datelined from Washington, it speaks of conditions in the U. S. on the 17th February, 1950. It speaks of unemployment. You will remember there were millions of people unemployed in the United States a year ago with the prospect that that unemployment would increase. This financial editor, in referring to these conditions, in referring to the possibility of a sharp decline in industrial production, says that "If industrial production should decline and if unemployment should increase the armament business will continue to be very good." It continues: "Armaments can always be pushed if private activity slows. War scares are easy to create, are nearly sure fire producers of money for more and more arms." Listen to this. "There are signs now

that top officials are to start conditioning the public for greatly expanded armament programs in the not too distant future." It then finishes with these words: "The armament business, under the circumstances, still looks like a good line of business."

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): You would say that Stalin certainly helped it.

MR. MacLEOD: It would be too much to expect that the apiarist from Snake Island would not make an interjection.

MR. DENNISON: That is an improper remark.

MR. MacLEOD: There is nothing improper about that at all.

MR. DENNISON: I wish that remark withdrawn.

MR. MacLEOD: I was referring to the apiarist from Snake Island. I do not know who he is.

MR. DENNISON: There is something wrong with that. I will not have a member of the House say that I am the member from Snake Island.

MR. MacLEOD: I made no reference whatever to the member for St. David.

MR. DENNISON: I insist that that remark be withdrawn unconditionally.

MR. SPEAKER: I rule there is nothing wrong with that remark.

MR. DENNISON: I insist on that remark being withdrawn. I made a perfectly fair reference. The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) was referring to what he suggested was propaganda from munitions groups in the United States.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I repeat, again, my

reference--

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): It was rather a bad pun, as a matter of fact.

MR. MacLEOD: As a matter of fact, I thought it was much brighter than some of yours. But, as a result of what I have said and for some unknown reason the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) objected. Now, since he did object and since he has interjected, may I say that if the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) is going to buzz, let him buzz on his own time, not on mine. I think he swallowed a couple of Queen bees a year or so ago. He has not been able to keep quiet since.

MR. DENNISON: At least I did not swallow the Stalin line, that the United States started the war in Korea.

MR. MacLEOD: Now, you should read Mr. Douglas of yesterday. You are not even up to date.

MR. DENNISON: It might do the hon. member from St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) good to read Mr. Douglas.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): He is all mixed up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacLEOD: Now, continuing my trend of thought, Mr. Speaker--

MR. JOLLIFFE: Your what?

MR. MacLEOD: If the dry Rhodes scholar would just simply contain himself we would get on. You spoke for one and one half hours and nobody said a mumbling word. Now, could you not keep quiet? After all, you went to a finishing school.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am keeping quiet. If the hon. member

from Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) would spend his time speaking and not lecturing we would get ahead.

MR. MacLEOD: I am not a lecturer. If you will just leave me alone I will continue and then you will have your turn.

Before I was interrupted, I was quoting from a magazine published in the United States. I would like now to come back to Canada and quote from the Toronto Daily Star of October 18, 1948, the following: "If there is a considerable drop in capital investment in Canada the rearmament program will take up the slack in the use of steel and manpower. This adds up to the fact that a recession in Canadian economy is not possible in the next few years providing international tension continues."

(TAKE "H" FOLLOWS)

That was written in the Toronto Daily Star of October 18, 1948.

Now, turning to the Toronto Daily Star of February 5th, 1951,

> "In reviewing 1950, The Canadian Bank of Commerce says that Canada's economy sagged a little at the mid point, but after June, however, it started to advance again due to the Korean affair."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will move very hurriedly and just put on the record the bare headlines which have been appearing in the papers since we last met.

First, a New York paper of October 23rd, 1950, says,

> "Wall Street feels bullish impact of re-armament."
>
> January 7th, 1951,
>
> "Truman's budget pushes stocks at New York higher."
>
> January 9th, 1951,
>
> "Truman all for arms like tonic to Wall Street, aircrafts, steels, best."
>
> The Globe and Mail, January 15th, 1951,
>
> "U.N. peace moves send grain prices into lower ground."
>
> The Toronto Daily Star of December 5th, 1950,
>
> "Only war threat closing dollar gap, Briton says."
>
> Then the Toronto Daily Star, December 2nd, 1950,
>
> "See business slump within a year if war

does not get worse."

"If war does not get worse", Canada is going to be in a depression within twelve months, Alexander Gray, Sr., told the Canadian Exporters Association.

The Toronto Daily Star of November 14th, 1950,

> "Increased prices help to push profits to new record high. International Nickel Company of Canada climbed $8,441,000.00, or 166%, in the three months ended September 30th. The Company showed a consolidated net for the quarter of $13,000.000, compared with $5,000,000 in the same period last year."

The Toronto Daily Star of November 13th, 1950,

> "Fatter Profits Spur Bigger Dividends"

Then finally the Globe and Mail of January 19th, 1951,

> "A list of war contracts given to some 25 of 30 corporations in the United States totalling $2,809,000,000."

And as I look over these lists I do not find it difficult to understand why Mr. Rhys Sale's tongue is hanging down, because that is just a small down-payment on what is coming later.

Now, bear in mind that these are headlines which have appeared in the papers in the past few months.

Now listen to this one!

"Canadians must prepare for austerity, says McCann."

And then this headline from the London Free Press a few days ago,

"Canadians' belts tighten for a few generations, Claxton warns."

Is it any wonder that Thomas Richard Henry, that very interesting columnist of the Toronto Evening Telegram, should have written as he did about the very things I have been describing?

Thomas Richard Henry in his column said:

"Facing the possibility of another world war everybody will have a role to play.
We helped fight the First World War, and we didn't like that much.
We helped pay for the Second World War, and we didn't like that either.
If we have another world war we think we would like to be a war profiteer.
A profiteer faces a little adverse criticism at the time but a big bank balance seems to command more respect than a trunk full of decorations after the war is over."

There is a lot of truth in that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why do I refer to these things? I mention these matters because it is my strong opinion that our approach to these world conditions which are described in the Speech from the Throne are altogether too uncritical. I think we are being hoodwinked. I do not think we are reading the truth in the newspapers, unless it is on the financial pages. I think what we read from the financial pages is quite true because they admit that themselves.

But, for the past few weeks we have been reading in our papers about the Chinese intervention in Korea and we

have been reading such astounding things.

Here is an extract from the Toronto Telegram of December 27th, 1950;

"General McArthur estimates that 444,406 Chinese are deployed along the front stretching across the Peninsula; he reported that 277,173 of these troops are Chinese and the rest of them are North Koreans."

Just think of that for a moment. "444,406" and "277,173". What kind of people do they think we are that we are going to believe that kind of nonsense.

When you read that despatch a bit further you find that the thing the story is based upon is a limited engagement in which a few platoons of soldiers were involved, and is it any wonder that the war correspondents in Korea have a standing joke, "how many hordes make up a platoon".

I want to say to the House that I think the time has come to think a little more clearly on these matters. The world is in a very tense condition, and I must say that the stories in the papers are not helping to lessen that tension very much.

I notice in to-day in the Toronto Daily Star one of the most horrible headlines I have ever seen in a newspaper. Listen to this, from the Toronto Daily Star:

"Meat Grinder" Chops up 100,000 near Seoul"

Is that not wonderful stuff for children to be reading in the newspapers,

"Meat Grinder" Chops up 100,000 near Seoul"?

Then, of course, I could go on and refer to other

things appearing in the papers which do not help us to develop a sane approach to these questions.

I think, it is the desire of every hon. member of this Legislature, regardless of party affiliation, to see an end to hostilities in Korea. I believe that. I do not think there is a single hon. member in this House who does not wish that the war, which is taking place in Asia to-day, shall end as quickly as possible. And, as I said at the outset of my remarks, it looked as if that might happen a couple of weeks ago. There was a proposal before the United Nations at Lake Success which appeared to be terminating the conflict. The United States made an intervention and insisted that proposals should be voted down and that its proposal for continuing the war should be supported. Our own hon. Minister of External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) told the people of this country that in his opinion the proposal of the United States was dangerous, premature and unwise, and then a few days later the same hon. Minister of External Affairs for Canada (Mr. Pearson) voted for that proposal.

This now means there will be no peace in Korea, and that the war will go on, and with the continuation of the war, we shall go home with our newspapers every evening and read more and more despatches like the following dated January 29th by William Stephenson of The Star:

(Mr. MacLeod reads quotation).

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to leave this now. I want to say this to the House, that every hon. member of this House was raised in a home where human values were held rather

high. We were taught to believe that human life - not the life of white people but human life is a very precious thing, and it does seem strange indeed that with the sort of thing we are reading in our papers every day, that men in high places - not only in politics but in other stations of public life - are thinking so little, are expressing so little regard, and saying so little, by way of condemnation of those who stand in the way of putting an end to the sort of thing which is happening in Korea.

(TAKE "I" FOLLOWS)

A few months ago -- a month or two ago, perhaps it was -- I had the great sorrow to attend the funeral of a very distinguished clergyman in the City of Toronto. He was a very good friend of mine. We had a pleasant association, a friendly association that extended over some fifteen or twenty years. He is known to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), who spoke in his church a month or two before he died. I am referring to the late Very Reverend Peter Bryce.

I remember back in 1938 when war was going on in China, when death was being rained down on the Chinese people-with weapons produced in this country and in the United States, do not forget that -- and when war was raging in Abyssinia and other countries and we were reading of terrible atrocities in our newspapers, Dr. Bryce, who was a very quiet-spoken man, not easily stirred to anger, wrote a letter to the Toronto Daily Star which I think I should put on the record. It is short. One day after the atrocity stories were particularly bad, Dr. Bryce wrote these words to the paper in which he wrote many articles; he said:

> "In the name of our common humanity, and with all the strength of my being, I protest against the awful massacre of men, women and children as reported day by day from China. I can no longer be silent. I cry out against this thing that in recent months has brought terror to the faces of countless children, this thing that comes out from the sea and belches forth destruction to a defenceless village, this thing which, without a moment's

warning, descends from the air upon the shopping district of a great city. We read that hundreds of babies were hurled, tristed and burned black; rivers of blood ran down the trolley tracks; bodies were torn to remnants, arms and legs flattened against the building fronts.

"The man in the street fitly describes it as wholesale, stark, bloody, hellish murder, and no diplomat can change this judgment of the great mass of the people. They are sick with horror of this fearful blot on our civilization.

"The governments of the world should know by the strength of public expression that millions upon millions of people are being outraged in every humanitarian instinct as each day brings new stories of untold suffering from the arena of warfare. The mighty power of sentiment against all that is involved in modern warfare may yet save the world from disaster if it is expressed individually by the people of the world and if it is crystallized into action by governments compelled to do so through the sheer force and weight of public opinion."

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to hon. members of this House that we might very well ponder those powerful, seering words of Peter Bryce and begin to hink a little more rationally.

I repeat what I said at the beginning in commenting on the contribution made by my hon. friend the Member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve): there are no differences between the great powers in this world to-day, just as there are no deep differences in this Chamber or in this province or in this country, that need to stand in the way of saving the community, the nation and the world from the horror and destruction of a third world war.

We have had some discussion in this House about the cost of government, and there are objections that the government is spending too much money. Well, of course, nobody wants to see money wasted, but not long ago I happened to pick up a copy of Harper's Magazine and read an article over the signature of Professor Henry Haslett, who computed the cost of the Second World War. I hesitate to mention the figure even to the hon. Treasurer of the Province of Ontario (Mr. Frost), who is accustomed to think in large terms, or to my hon. friend the former Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Dunbar), but here is the figure: $4 trillion. Can you comprehend that? Do you think you will ever be able to bring in a budget with a figure like that?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: I had to take it and break it down. This is the way it works out, Mr. Speaker. It is the equivalent of $2,000 for every man, woman and child on the face of the earth. That is what $4 trillion is. Or, to put it another way, you could give every family on the face of the earth an $8,000 home for what it cost to wage the Second World War.

Now here is the point. Haslett points out that, having regard to new weapons of destruction, new means of annihilation, a third world war would cost 70 times -- 70 times -- the cost of the Second World War.

We read in our paper the other day that it is going to cost this country $5 billion to carry through the present armament program -- $5 billion over the next few years. Do you know how much money that is? Well, I did a little arithmetic on that too, and I found that $5 billion amounts to five dollars for every minute since the Prince of Peace was born in Bethlehem. That is what $5 billion is. And the United States is going to spend $130 for every minute since the Prince of Peace was born in Bethlehem. And we are alarmed over the cost of government in the Province of Ontario.

Well, I say that if we are going to do any of the things that the Speech from the Throne mentions, and if the Government is going to be able to carry out any of the proposals made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the additional proposals made by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), indeed, if Ontario is going to survive as a province and Canada survive as a nation, some way has to be found to relax world tension. Some way has got to be found to get those who are in conflict to sit down around the conference table.

I can remember a former Prime Minister (Mr. Drew) standing up here and using such terrible terms describing the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. King) that one wondered whether they could ever appear in the same room. But that day is past. The hon. Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Frost)

looks very handsome alongside of the hon. Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. St.Laurent); they are getting along very well together. What is possible on a national scale is possible on an international scale.

Why have I talked so much on this subject? I have spent time on this, Mr. Speaker, because I say that the issue of war is too important a matter to be left to generals or to the politicians at the federal level of government. I say that world peace and the peace of Canada is the concern of everybody in Canada, and there are people in this House who have looked death in the face, like my hon. friend the member for Durham (Mr. Foote). And many others in the House who have served in either one of the world wars certainly have earned a right to express an opinion on these things.

(TAKE "J" FOLLOWS)

Must we leave the question of Canada's role in world affairs, the course that Canada is going to assume to some politician at Ottawa or Washington or to Senator Austin? I think that the people of Canada through their government when they believe that a certain course is necessary to preserve world peace, they must take and follow that course regardless of any dictation from Washington, from Senator Austin or from anybody else. Who are these people to order us around? Who are these people who say to India that wants 20,000,000 bushels of wheat to save 20,000,000 people from starvation "we will have to think it over because you have not voted for us in the United Nations?" What kind of business is that? I would like to repeat here what Sir Gladwyn Jebb, the British delegate to the United Nations said, I would like to read his words to this House. He said at a debate on the question of Korea:

> "I ask my colleagues who sit around this table to put their hands on their hearts and say that they are convinced that everything possible has been done to keep open the door of peaceful negotiations in Korea."

I would say to the hon.members of this House, regardless of party, patriotism is not something that is centred in either one side of this House or the other, regardless of political differences we all have this in common, we live in Canada, we share a common citizenship, we are confronted with a common problem and it is up to us to save our children and our homes from annihilation. I say to the House it is necessary to restore a balance in world affairs. I do not think there

will be peace in the world -- I do not think that peace will be restored to the world so long as the United States and other governments insist on depriving their rightful place in the United Nations the great Chinese nation. China is a member of the United Nations, China was a founding member of the United Nations and no government has any right to deprive the legitimate representatives of China from taking their place around the council table of the United Nations. I want to say to the House that in my opinion when that is done the world will have taken a long stride towards not only the restoration of peace in the world but the preservation of peace for a very long time to come. I can understand the attitude of the Chinese. After all, the House should not forget that in 1776 there were a lot of people in England who took the same dim view of what was happening in the United States of America as people take to-day over what is happening in China, but thank God there have always been great Englishmen. I am no friend of colonialism or imperialism, but there are many times when one can thank the Lord that there is such a country as England. In 1776 when General Burgoyne surrendered to Gates on the Saratoga Heights and people were terribly aroused in England, the Elder Pitt arose and told the House of Commons, "You cannot defeat America." He continued, "If I were an American as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country I would never lay down my arms, never, never, never." That is the way the Chinese feel to-day when they see the United States grabbing Formosa which means to them the same thing as though the United States were to grab Prince Edward Island or one of the provinces of Canada.

Formosa has been part of China for hundreds of years; what right has any power thousands of miles away to take it over and without any sanction from the United Nations, or anybody else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few things on two other points. First of all, about natural resources in the Province of Ontario. I dealt with this at some length last year. I dealt specifically with the question of iron ore and I was very much interested a couple of weeks ago to pick up the annual report of the Bank of Toronto and find that the President of that institution speaking at the 95th Annual Meeting laid great emphasis on the question of the development and the processing in Canada of these great natural resources of ours. For instance, among other things he deals with the forest industry and he points out that in 1949 the forest industry took pulp wood valued at $240,000,000 and converted it into products having a gross value of $836,000,000. That is very interesting. Perhaps the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) could tell me without interrupting me whether that conversion of $240,000,000 into $836,000,000 represents only the semi-processing in Ontario or does it refer to the continuous process along the line? You would not know. I am inclined to think myself that the $830,000,000 refers only to the conversion of pulp wood into wood pulp.

(TAKE "K" FOLLOWS)

But, when the wood pulp reaches its destination in the United States that figure of $836,000,000 might very well increase another threefold. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I think we could say that for every job provided in the Province of Ontario in that industry, in the cutting and semi-processing, no less than three or four jobs are provided in the United States.

Now, Mr. Carson, who I assure you does not belong to our Party, had a great deal to say about that. Among other things he says:

> "I would suggest that our Government make every possible effort to obtain tariff reductions so that more of our pulp can be processed in Canada into fine papers, for which there is a very large market in the United States."

He has a great deal to say about iron ore. He points out that we produce two and one-half million tons of finished steel per year, and last year we imported 1,100,000 tons of finished steel. And he says:

> "Steel still is king of metals, and shortage of it at critical periods of development can paralyze production. We produce about 2½ million tons of finished steel per year. We imported over the last 10 years one million one hundred thousand tons of finished steel per year. I am confident that we have facilities and engineering skills in Canada whereby our own ore could be processed until

"current production is doubled. Also I am sure that if we could produce 5 million tons of steel a year, good and profitable use could be made of it. With veritable mountains of high-grade ore in Canada there is little excuse for serious shortages of steel in this country. The way is open for bold and skillful leadership from our steel men - to process our own ore, to manufacture more of our own steel products and to sell more of them here and abroad. Initiative should come from within the industry, and it is encouraging to note in recent weeks that expansion of production is being contemplated.

"The matter of processing applies to other industries but I shall refer only to the pulp industry. In 1949 the industry took pulpwood valued at $240,000,000 and converted it into products having a gross value of $836,000,000, thus increasing by 3½ times the value of the wood which it used, an excellent performance. Nevertheless, it is my understanding that there are still large quantities of pulpwood being exported to the United States, and this also applies to pulp. I would suggest that our government make every possible effort to obtain a reasonable tariff reduction so that more of our pulp can be further processed and converted into fine papers, for which there is a large

"market in the United States."

And he goes on to deal with the matter at considerable length.

Now, of course, what Mr. Carson says in that Annual Report of the Bank of Toronto was said before by Major-General Kennedy, the author of the Kennedy Report, and I would like the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to listen to this, if he does not mind. This is from the Kennedy Report, wherein he says:

> "As long as the present export policy continues in effect, the people of this Province may well be classed as "hewers of wood" for the United States mills who are the beneficiaries. It is to be noted that no Canadian company which has an export agreement has a Canadian paper mill dependent upon the area leased. It is only by manufacturing a more highly developed product than pulp that we shall reap the optimum advantage of our forest resources.
>
> "For the present, export can be defended and any remedial action taken should be gradual rather than precipitate. The national feature of the problem should be properly weighted but not overweighted, as is the tendency in some circles. Companies which have maintained operations in the Province for many years have a greater claim to consideration than those which have entered the field recently.
>
> "I was much impressed by the argument in one

"brief presented before the Commission. It pointed out that unprocessed pulpwood exported has a value of roughly half a cent per pound, but if this same wood were processed it would result in a product worth at least four cents per pound and possible several times that amount. The difference in cost per pound between the pulpwood stage and that of the finished product would be made up largely of wages paid to Canadian labour. I subscribe to the idea expressed, and recommend that the future policy of the Province be aimed toward the development of the final product at the higher cost per pound. In the meantime, there should be made available for export only the annual growth which is surplus to the needs of present domestic enterprises and their normal expansion, including the building of new mills."

Now, I see my good friend the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies) is not in his seat. But when we were on that jaunt to north-western Ontario, we were banqueted one night at Terrace Bay, and there were some high-powered American there to talk with us. There was one gentleman by the name of Mr. Sage of the Kimberly-Clark Corporation. He is a very slick and very plausible gentleman, and he made an eloquent speech. When he sat down, my hon. friend, the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies)

got up and almost tearfully said, you know, Mr. Chairman, "I am always deeply moved when I hear our good friends from the United States manifesting such great faith in our country. As a matter of fact I sometimes feel that our friends from the United States have greater faith in Canada and in Ontario than we, ourselves, have."

That is true. The Board of Directors of the Kimberly-Clark Corporation - this great American corporation which has such a strangle-hold on the timber stands of north-western Canada, has faith in Canada. They have not only the faith that removes mountains, but they have the faith that removes forests.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): And Governments.

MR. MacLEOD: Yes, and Governments. And the fish out of the waters, the oil, and all the rest of it.

I think it is about time that my friend, the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Frost) began to do something about the things in which he expresses faith. You can refer to Hansard. I remember a wonderful speech in which he said, "I want to say this to you" - did you ever hear him say that? - "I believe the time is not far distant when the ore at Steep Rock will be processed at the head of the Lakes."

That is what he said. It is in Hansard.

When, Mr. Speaker? When will that happen?

MR. JOLLIFFE: When the C.C.F. get in power.

MR. MacLEOD: I see in the papers that will not happen until 1967 - that is a long time to wait. I do not want to wait that long.

Here we have a situation where our ore is going across the line. Last year Steep Rock stock was worth $2.41; now it is up to $10.00, and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) is not unloading, because it is going up to $25.00 per share, and he had better hold on to it.

What is going to happen?

(TAKE "L" FOLLOWS)

It is going to go to $25.00. And Cyrus Eaton has 1,500,000 shares which he got at a cent a share. What is going to happen when he cashes in on that? That operation is subsidized by the taxpayers of Ontario, 5% interest to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at Washington on the money they have invested there. We get nothing out of it in return for our investment, the millions of dollars invested at Steep Rock, just as we get nothing out of the millions of dollars of the taxpayers money invested in the pulp and paper industry in north-western Ontario. Whose money built those great Hydro plants up there that service that industry at such small cost and charge the little consumer so much for that power. Talk about economic aggression. I do not know that it is that. It is a sort of negotiated robbery which is going on in north-western Ontario to-day.

Now, I hope very much the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) of this province will make up his mind that he is going to stay in office for a couple of years more. Do not call an election. We have nothing to worry about. The Opposition is not causing you much trouble. It is causing you so little trouble that you did not even feel it necessary to reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) yesterday.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): He never does.

MR. MacLEOD: We will co-operate with you. I would suggest to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), who is a great student of Canadian history and a great admirer of the great men of Canada, that he be the first Prime Minister of a great

province to stand up on his feet and say "So far as my government is concerned, Ontario is not going to be an industrial colony of the United States."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: " ---- but we are going to take the great, rich resources of this province of ours and develop them for not only the benefit of the people we have here to-day but for the millions of new people who will come to this country in the years ahead. I want to say that if Macdonald and Brown and the other men of 1867 were to come back to this country to-day they would think "What have you people been doing to the nation that we built?" So, I say the time has come for the Government and the people of this province to stand on guard, to stand on guard against those who are out to grab everything we have after they have despoiled everything that they had. They have ruined their own forests, they have looted their own mines and now they look with envious, covetous eyes on what we have here. We have an abundance of natural resources. I am not suggesting that we say to them, "We will give you nothing," but we should say to them what they said to us 50, 60 years ago, that is, "Your adversity is our opportunity" and we should charge them a stiffer price for what they are taking away, and we should tell Kimberley-Clark and the others "We will give you timber stand. We will let you cut down the trees, but if you are going to cut them down, you are going to finish the job here and process that wood pulp in Canada."

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is six on the clock and I do not want to detain the House longer. There were a couple of

other things I wanted to say. I wanted to deal with human resources because those are the two great assets we possess in Ontario. There are natural resources, --- metals, forests and so on -- but we also have human resources without which the other things do not count very much.

In taking my seat, I would urge the Government to get busy despite the obstacles at Ottawa puts in the way and do something about the scandalous housing situation in this province. We have tens of thousands of people in the Province of Ontario who are living in houses which are not fit for human beings.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: And nothing that this government has done in the last seven years has changed that situation one iota.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear..

MR. MacLEOD: The houses which have been built have brought no comfort or relief to those people. All the slums that we had in 1943 we have in 1951. I say that the Prime Minister of Ontario can do something more than just make a pleasant little statement before the Orders of the Day, or say that he does not agree with the hon. Prime Minister of this province (Mr. Frost) is a very powerful man. The Prime Minister of the Province of Ontario (Mr. Frost) is second as a political figure only to the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. St.Laurent) and he can speak for four and one-half million people of this province who will back him up to the hilt in the demand that he can make for priority in the matter of building not $8,000 and $10,000 homes, but a

comprehensive program that will erect at least 20,000 to 25,000 low-rental subsidized homes a year for the next five years in this province. That could be done. I repeat, that could be done and the Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Frost) could rally to his side every man and woman in this province. You can do it if you want to.

Lastly, if you will permit me one more minute, a few words with respect to old-age pensions. I think that the projected legislation on old-age pensions is just pure window dressing. They are going to pass legislation which will enable Ontario to co-operate with Ottawa if Ottawa and the other provinces should ever get around to passing legislation that will eliminate the means test and provide a small pension for people between 76 and 70.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): After the next Federal election.

MR. MacLEOD: Yes, after the next Federal election. I say this to the hon. member from Lindsay (Mr. Frost), you are very rich; you are much richer than the rich young ruler; you have more money than you know what to do with; and wait until the Budget comes down and see what the 7% Corporation Profits Tax yields this year.

There is no reason in the world why the Government of Ontario at this Session cannot provide an additional $10 a month for every one of the 90,000 old-age pensioners in this province. It will cost $9,000,000 or $10,000,000. What is that? It is peanuts; but it will make a big difference to these 90,000 people who are living in a condition where, as I have said, very often they are too poor to live and too

too rich to die. Come across with $10,000,000 this Session and bring the pension up to $50 a month for the present pensioner, as they have done in British Columbia. That is the human thing to do; that is the decent thing to do, and I believe however much we may disagree with him or some things that the Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Frost) has that generosity of heart, has that desire to make life better for the people and that he will not allow a paltry $10,000,000 to stand in the way of making life a little better, a little sweeter for these 90,000 people who are drawing the old-age pension now.

Mr. Speaker, may I express to the House through you my very sincere appreciation of the courteous hearing I have received after having taken up more time than I should have.

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

(TAKE "M" FOLLOWS)

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister) Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House may I say that to-morrow we meet at two o'clock and we will proceed, as far as we can with second readings, and we will continue with them on Monday, and perhaps go into Committee on some Bills, if he progress far enough. I should imagine, with the Government orders in to-day, that the twenty Government orders may be extended to thirty or thirty-five, so we have a great deal of business before us.

On Tuesday we will proceed with the Throne Debate. If we can make good progress I will try and keep away from night sittings on Tuesday and Thursday if possible, but it depends, of course, on the progress we make, because we still have a great deal on the order papers now after being in session only half a dozen days.

Next Wednesday we will start an innovation. We will have a Private Members' day on Wednesday.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: We will try to continue that as long as it is not necessary to give precedence to Government orders. The hon. members will understand we have to make progress at those times. I would ask the hon. members on Wednesday to please not discuss Korea, if you do not mind. If we can stick to this, and confine ourselves to Private Members' Bills, we should be able to clear off a number of them on Wednesday. I do not know that we will pass any of them, but we can certainly give them a boost, one way or another.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: And dispose of them.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the order of things as we have them now.

Just to show, Mr. Speaker, that we have made progress to-day, I want to table the answer to question No. 29, and with that I will move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:08 p.m.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

ONTARIO

Third Session
of the
Twenty-Third Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

Toronto, Ontario, February 9, 1951, et seq.

Volume VII

Friday, February 9, 1951.

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

Hon- (Rev.) M. C. Davies, Speaker

Volume VII.

Friday, February 9, 1951.

- - - - -

Toronto, Ont. 2:00 o'clock, p. m.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by Committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the Day.

hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table answers to questions nos. 10 and 16.

In connection with question no. 16, - which concerns the number of convictions for drunkenness last year in Ontario - the amount is given as "32,911", which is, of course, a substantial number. I was, however, interested to note that for the previous year, the number was "32,701", so it may be, like the net debt of the province, we have "levelled off".

MR. HARRY MILLON, (Brant): Take an average over a number of years.

MR. FROST: I find these two years more favourable.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): "Tapering off", would be better.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister); Order number 24.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that today we will proceed with second readings, of which there are a large number on the Order paper. If there be any which the hon. members have not had sufficient time to consider, they can be held over until Monday, but I would like to get through as many second readings as possible today.

DESERTED WIVES AND CHILDREN'S MAINTENANCE ACT.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-fourth order. Second reading of Bill no. 40, "An Act to amend the Deserted Wives and Children's Maintenance Act", Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER: (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move second reading of Bill No. 40, "An Act to Amend the Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act".

Mr. Speaker, this Bill does not in any way alter the procedure which is now laid down in the Act, but in the course of the revision of the Statutes, it was found that this section which is being covered here by this Bill, was an accummulation of the number of amendments which had come about from time to time, and the draftsmanship was difficult in the revision itself. Those who were responsible for the revision of the Statutes have recommended that this whole section be re-drafted, to simplify the wording and make it clearer for those who have administered this part of the Act. There is no new principle or procedure involved.

MR. W. J. GRULLETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I spoke on this question last year in the House, and the comments I made at that time received very favourable mention in the Press, especially in my own Riding, where we have a lot of difficult in connection with deserting husbands.

I agree with the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) that when speaking to a Bill in the House, we should adhere as closely as possible to the subject matter of the amendment, therefore, I am not going into this matter at length today, but later in the session I will cover the whole matter and make suggestions which I think may impress the hon. Atrorney General (Mr. Porter) and the hon. Ministers of the Cabinet.

This is a problem in our province which is becoming daily more aggravating, and I think it behooves us all to pay particular attention to it now, before it gets out of hand.

Dealing with the amendment: I have carefully examined the amendment to Bill no. 40, and, as stated by the hon. Attorney General, it does not involve any new principle; it merely re-arranges the sections, and perhaps changes a word here and there. For instance, in the old Bill, I believe sub-section 2, started off with the word "whenever" ; in the new Bill, that is changed to "when" - and so on.

But there is one principle in the Bill, which the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) did not mention, and that is sub-section 3. That is a new principle. I do not believe it was in the old Act.

Sub-section 9 (a) was in the old Act as sub-section 1 of section 9. That is the reference to summary convictions, and it was a reference to section 1033 (a) of the Criminal Code, and is a new section in this Act. I think the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) should mention exactly what that new provision provides.

Generally speaking, it provides that a person convicted and fined, or sentenced, upon failing to pay the fine, to a term of imprisonment, is not permitted to serve part of his sentence and then pay a certain portion of his fine, and be released. That is a provision of section 1055 (a) of the Criminal Code, which is removed from the operation of this section. In other words, a person sent to jail under this section, must serve the full three months - if he received a three-months' sentence.

I would like the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) to elaborate on that sub-section, so the hon. members of the House will understand why this section was put into this Act, in this manner.

hon. MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, it is always considered that this section of the Criminal Code was in the Act by implication, and the practice has been to regard it by implication as being in the Act, and this is simply expressly so stating.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It states that it shall not apply.

MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. GRUBERT: This section removes the privilege of a convicted person of paying the fine and being released. I agree whole-heartedly with the provisions put into the Act.

MR. PORTER: It was the provision excluding this section of the Criminal Code, which has generally been regarded as implied in the original Act, and has been followed. The Act has been administered with that understanding, and it was thought, inasmuch as the Act was being recast, it should be specifically set out in the Act.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON: (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) by this amendment is doing what he suggested to the House last year,, what it was his intention to do? He will probably remember the afternoon he and I discussed these "absconding Lotharios", and we agreed they were a bad bunch. This Act is intended to penalize any man who deserts his wife, and to require him to pay the maintenance, whether he travels a mile away or fifty miles away. This Act is intended to guarantee to a family some sustenance. Unfortunately, in the operation of this Act, I am not certain this section will rectify that injustice.

Unfortunately, in the operation of the Act, many wives find that their husbands leave home. They sometimes secure a judgment againgst the husband, whereby he is required to pay a certain amount, and then he disappears, and when the wife

approaches the Police, asking for assistance, the Police tell her, "We are sorry; it is not our responsibility". Then, if she approaches the judge of the Family Court, - and I have had a good deal to do with the operation of this - the judge also tells her, "You find your husband, and I will have him summonsed again".

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, in the administration of this Act, the department should adopt some means of dragging these people back.

I knew of a family in my Riding, just this last Fall, where the boy, fourteen years of age, had to go to work leaving High School, because his mother was not able to locate her hudband. She had difficulty in getting relief.

I brought this up last year, and I think there should be a provision in this Act, whereby if a husband has absconded and the wife has an idea where he has moved, she should be able to secure an order, which would require the Police in that place, to find him and collect the money.

This amendment allows a Judge to make an order, but the first duty is for the wife to bring the husband back. I do not think that should be. I think, no matter where a man is, he should not be brought back, but he should be taxed wherever he is, because sometimes if he is brought back it sometimes causes family trouble. It is better to leave the deserting husband where he is, and let him work, wherever he may be, and the farther away, the better, as long as she gets the money.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, may I just make an enquiry to the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter)? This sub-section 2 of Section 1 -- does it apply only to the Province of Ontario, or has the Province any arrangement with other provinces or through the Federal Government for the serving of a Judge's order outside of the Province? o I make my question clear?

MR. PORTER: Perfectly clear, if you stop there.

MR. SALSBERG: I will stop right there, Sir.

MR. PORTER: I do not want to get bogged down in too complicated a matter.

MR. SALSBERG: You are, already.

MR. PORTER: Your question is clear as a bell. There is a provision in the Act for enforcing orders outside of the Province, but it is not in this particular section.

MR. ROBERT THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if the intention of the amendment is to punish a defaulter when no payment is made? Would it not be in keeping with the spirit of the law, if this amendment were so designed not to punish the offender, but rather to seize any assets he might have, to cover the default. Of course, punishment would only lose the offender his job, and make him unable to pay, but he may have other assets which would satisfy the amount of the default.

MR. PORTER: This Act, of course, is designed to apply to people who have not much in the way of assets, and the only way of bringing them to task is by this penal procedure. If a man has assets, it is not generally difficult to find him, because he cannot get away very far and take his assets with him, without leaving a trace.

There are ways and means of getting a judgment to attach his assets, and it may not be necessary to invoke this Act at all, but where a man is attempting to evade his responsibilities, and has nothing upon which you can lay your hands, then this penal system can be relied upon.

I might elaborate a little on that. Section 10 of the Act provides:

> "That any order for payment of money may also be filed with the clerk of any Division Court, and be enforced by execution of a judgment summons, as in the case of a judgment in the Division Court."

That brings it in line with the regular Civil Court procedure, so that any judgment under this Act which may, to some extent, provide for a penalty or a sentence of some kind, can be supplemented by having the order filed in this, as it applies to the payment of money, and to enforce it in the usual way.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I notice Section 9 it says:

> "The Judge or Magistrate may order and

adjudge" which makes it permissive.

I am under the impression that if a husband has deserted his wife, under conditions whereby he was ordered to pay some alimony or some money for sustenance of the children, but with malice aforethought he has decided to leave the country, I presume under those circumstances the law should have more teeth, perhaps to the extent of having it read: "shall" instead of: "may".

(TAKE "B" FOLLOWS)

Now, I know that the purpose of the framing of this section is to leave a discretionary power within the Judge and I feel that whenever a husband or a father has deserted his family, well, usually the I.Q. is not of a very high level and there is a temptation for the Magistrate to say, "Well, let bygones be bygones and we are starting from another day and from now on you are going to be a good boy". But, while the husband has left the family or the home, usually , the welfare of these persons has been assumed by the Welfare Department of the municipality which means the community had to look after the dependents. Now, in these circumstances, when a husband or father has deserted his family willingly, deliberately and with malice aforethought. I think the Welfare Department of any community would be quite willing to continue this cooperation for the sustenance of the family and the wife and it would be far more advanced if the husband was given a prison term. Therefore, I think in order to put more teeth in it, this section should not read, "may" but it should read "shall".

MR. PORTER: Well, Mr. Speaker, generally we take the position that there might conceivably be two sides to almost any case and the Judge is a man who is to hear the evidence both ways and if he thinks it is a case that requires an order of this kind surely he is the best man to decide. That would be our position.

MR. G.B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, following the remarks of the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand) I would like to point out to the

hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) that one of the problems that exist with respect to these actions in trying to force men to assume their just responsibilities is the reluctance of our Courts to issue an order. That has been brought to our attention many times when our City Sollicitors have gone into Court and tried to get an order against those who could well afford, in the opinion of the City, and also the opinion of the Solicitor, [illegible] to pay for at least a portion of the cost of the keeping of their dependents by the Children's Aid Society. Yet, we have repeatedly, found that the Magistrates are very reluctant to issue these orders under the present Act.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St.Andrew): Where is that, Windsor?

MR. ELLIS: I am speaking of Windsor because my experience has been there but the fact remains, if we are going to try to strenghten the Act then, definitely the Act should be strenghtened along these lines [illegible] as suggested by the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand). I think the time has come when we will have to do more than tell a Magistrate that he "may" issue an order, I think the Act should set out that if in the opinion of the Magistrate the parents or guardians of these children are in a position to make some contribution towards their upkeep, then the Magistrate must issue an order. I think that is the solution to a lot of our troubles at the present time.

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs):

Nothing in there about deserted husbands.

MR. CHARTRAND: Oh, make her pay.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. DANA H. PORTER (Attorney General): 25th Order.

THE JUSTICES OF THE PEACE ACT

CLERK OF THE COUNCIL: 21st Order, second reading of Bill No. 41, "An Act to amend the Justices of the Peace Act", Mr. Porter.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 41, "An Act to amend the Justices of the Peace Act".

MR. C.C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) if he had any particular territory in mind when drafting this Bill? Would he mind giving us some information on what prompted this Bill?

MR. PORTER: No. I know from time to time we have considered a man who happens to be a solicitor, sometimes from a place where there may not be any other man seeking this sort of appointment and we do not see why he should be excluded from performing these functions if he is a suitable person in other respects. That is all.

MR. W.J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) knows why in the original Act solicitors were excluded from being appointed?

MR. PORTER: That original Act was passed about one hundred years ago and I do not think there is

anything in the historic records that has come to my attention, that there is any law on it. Perhaps we have better solicitors now.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, does the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) think there any improvement in solicitors between 1852 and 1951 that should make us pass this?

MR. PORTER: I should say, Mr. Speaker, there has been improvement in all things.

Motion agreed to; second reading of this Bill.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): 23rd Order.

THE LANDTITLES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 22, second reading, Bill No. 42, "An Act to amend the Land Titles Act", Mr. Porter.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I really have nothing to add to the explanation I made on the first reading but in order to refresh the memory of the hon. members I shall outline it again. Under the present legislation there is authority under the Planning Act for municipalities to pass by-laws prohibiting sales of land under sub-divisions. It is difficult to enforce the by-law and there is no prohibition about registering a transfer under the Land Titles Act. The amendment will allow the Land Titles Act and the Planning Board to work together.

MR. W.J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) tell us whether or not the local masters of Titles have been informed

of the provision under the Planning Act? Now, in order to illustrate my point, I would like to explain an experience I had this past year. About August, a woman came to my office who owned a small parcel of land in a village in Playfair County. She wanted to sell two parts, about 10 acres, I think, she wanted to sell these, they were about 50 feet wide by 250 feet long. I prepared the transfers, had them executed, sent them to the local master of titles at Cochrane to have them registered. He returned them to me, pointing out they could not be registered because the township of Playfair has a Planning Board and he was not allowed to register them without the approval of the Planning Board. I sent them to the Clerk Treasurer of the Municipality asking him to have the Board approve them. That was around the end of August. About six weeks later I wrote again and he answered stating that the Planning Board had not met. My client called on the Clerk Treasurer a couple of times enquiring what could be done and eventually after writing five or six letters and getting no action I wrote a rather snappy letter about the middle of January and he replied saying that the Board had not yet met and if I could suggest some means whereby he could compel them to meet he would like to have the information. I agree with the prohibition against indiscriminate registering of transfers describing parcels by leaps and bounds. I also agree with the actions of the department in placing more balance on sub-divisions, but at the same time, I think we should have some protection against the Boards in that Act. Could we not do something

to this Bill providing that where a Board has failed to carry out its duties that that Board be ordered to act. Also, there is no appeal from a decision of the Planning Board. Could there not be an amendment put in the Act providing that if a person feels aggrieved by the decision of the Planning Board then let him apply to the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter). I think that would be a big imporvement.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the remarks of the hon. member (Mr. Grummett). We are just as anxious as he is that these matters will work smoothly. An attempt has been made to provide for some scheme of control of development and with that comes a lot of difficulties as the hon. member (Mr. Grummett) is well aware. My recollection is that there is some procedure in the Planning Act for appeal to the Minister. Now, in cases where a Planning Board does not act, any complaints can be registered with the approval of the Minister. Here is the very section.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): But it is done very rarely.

MR. PORTER: I know in my days it was done, it pleased a lot of people and I am sure it still does. "Unless consent of the Planning Board, if any, or there is a subsidiary planning area, the Minister is given".--- I know when I was in the Department we had a number of cases where we were able to expedite matters by acting without the local authorities when the local authorities were slow to act because this was a new department and

in many cases they found that the Planning Board, just as the hon. member (Mr. Grummett) has found, were not active and the appeal came directly to the Minister. I can assure the hon. member (Mr. Grummett) that it was always readily given wherever rightly sought and very promptly.

MR. GRUMMETT: I might say the last letter from a clerk treasurer came in the day before I came to Toronto and I did not have time to look up any statute.

MR. PORTER: It is section 24 of the Planning Act, that maybe of some help to the hon. member (Mr. Grummett).

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 23.

UNCLAIMED ARTICLES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 23rd Order, second reading, Bill No 43, "An Act to amend the unclaimed Articles Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No 43, "An Act to amend the Unclaimed Articles Act".

Mr. Speaker, I also explained this Bill, I think fully, on first reading. This is an Act that provides a procedure under the Unclaimed Articles of clothing and other things that have been deposited for cleaning, pressing, glazing, washing or repairing. The purpose is to include articles of clothing deposited for dyeing.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): Does this cover articles left in the cellar?

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Any other clocks?

MR. PORTER: The cellar or the attic or underground.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt); Does it cover the Commission on Education?

MR. PORTER: That is something that is left for "Dyeing."

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 24.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 24th Order, second reading of Bill No. 44, "An Act to amend the Department of Education Act," Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, this Bill simply provides that the Minister may require all school employees periodically to submit to medical examinations. Heretofore, that has only applied to the teachers.

MR. C. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, I regret I have not had time to look into the Education Act, but I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) this; is it possible that pursuant to an examination under this Bill the Board then has powers to deal correctly with a person carrying some contagious disease? I am thinking of the ringworm plague at Sault St. Marie.

MR. PORTER: Why not cite something happening in your own constituency?

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Nothing ever happens there.

MR. CALDER: We have no plagues, but having found where the trouble is, has the Board the power to take remedial actions?

MR. PORTER: I cannot answer that question offhand.

MR. FROST: Could you leave that for committee?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 25.

SCHOOL SITES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Order No. 25, second reading Bill No. 45, "An Act to amend the School Sites Act," Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 45, "An Act to amend the School Sites Act."

Mr. Speaker, this Bill repeals a Section of the School Sites Act which provided that no school could be located in a township within 100 yards of orchards, dwelling houses and pleasure grounds without the consent of the owner and without a certificate of a judge. It is proposed to repeal that by this Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): That was Liberal legislation.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) has said, "We propose to repeal". Now, I understand that the provision to be repealed has been on the statute books for a long time and for the moment I will play Conservative and let the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) play the radical in this matter when he advances a radical proposition like this, he should give at least one reason in support of it. The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) should suggest one reason why a provision which has been on the statute book for so many years should be removed. In what respect has it proved undesirable, unsatisfactory? I might say to the hon. Minister--and I am not now speaking as a Conservative--that from personal reminiscenses or experience--that the close proximity of a school to his apple orchard was what kept my grandfather a poor man for thirty or forty years.

MR. PORTER: Apparently the Act was not working too well.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, it was not. The school was the old Rockwood Academy which educated Mr. James J. Hill and one or two other robber barons and I believe also the late Sir Adam Beck who was a distinguished man of a different character. However, regardless of their character boys will be boys and their consumption is terrific in some cases. Now, seriously, what I am asking the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) today is, to suggest why he goes to all the trouble of repealing this particular subsection? It is a very small morsel in an enormous mass of work in relation to schools and education and

I am just wondering if there is any valid or substantial reason for going to all the trouble of repealing this Bill other than to give the appearance that the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) has some legislation to present at this Session.

MR. R.A. McEWING (Wellington North): Is this one of the recommendation in the Hope Report.

MR. FROST: You ought to know, you have read it.

MR. PORTER: Yes, you have read it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: This arises as a result of the growth of population in the suburbs in some of the larger municipalities where there is a mixture of rural land and subdivided land and in some cases it has been found impossible to find a school site unless it was adjacent to some of these prohibited places. The hon. Member's (Mr. Jolliffe) recollection of his grandfather's days was only in connection with orchards but I think if he reads the Bill he will notice many other features appear in that Act, as it includes gardens, dwelling houses and pleasure grounds. It is quite impossible to develop a rapidly growing section if such restrictions are to be maintained and in doing this it was considered somewhat out of line with modern times and modern developments that 100 yards should be prescribed as the distance. I am sure the children of today can run that far very quickly and I do not think 100 yards is going to make very much difference as to the security of the orchard, if it is an orchard the hon. Member (Mr. Jolliffe) is worrying about. In dealing with this, it was thought it

might be just as well to repeal the section entirely.

MR. R. THORNBURY (Hamilton Centre): Are there pleasure grounds other than Windsor.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HONOURABLE LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 26.

THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 26th Order, second reading Bill No. 46, "An Act to Amend The Vocational Education Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 46, an"Act to Amend The Vocational Education Act".

MR. [illegible] This Bill provides for the repeal of part three of The Vocational Act provided for the establishment of vocational school districts for two or more municipalities upon the application of the Board of Education or the High School Board of the municipality. No application has ever been made under this part since its enactment in 1931 and it is considered under present practise this section is unnecessary and should be repealed.

MR. C.C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, somewhat along the line of the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), if the only reason given for the repeal of this Bill is it has been unemployed for the last twenty years, that is hardly sufficient because twenty years is hardly long in the life of the law. You can find many other laws of the Province of Ontario that could fall

for the same reason. If we have a decisive policy here to do away with obsolete legislation let us go about it methodically. This seems a little haphazard and someday--we have been talking about 1951 consolidation and bigtime operation, the very day for this Act is probably approaching.

MR. PORTER: No, it is not under the present practise at all. If it had not been used some years ago there is no necessity for it now.

MR. CALDER: May I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter), is there any programme in the hon. Attorney General's Department (Mr. Porter) for gradually getting rid of effete legislation?

MR. PORTER: Yes, the programme is going on from year to year, we are lopping off branches from time to time.

MR. CALDER: I hope the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) himself will not fall.

MR. PORTER: The growth of the larger high school districts which have developed very rapidly in the last few years really makes this section less likely to be of any value to anyone.

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York West): I would like to ask the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) regarding this. Is this the preparation for carrying out certain recommendations in the commission of education report?

MR. PORTER: No, this has nothing to do with the report at all. These various amendments come forward as a result of experience in the last year where changes constantly have to be made to our statutes if they are to continue to meet the practical situation that arises from day to day.

MR. MILLARD: I would like to ask the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter), is there any instance now where the

larger school unit has been interfered with by this Bill?

MR. PORTER: No.

MR. MILLARD: Well, what is the reason for it?

MR. PORTER: It is an obsolete section and we do not want an obsolete section on the statute book.

MR. MILLARD: What makes it obsolete?

MR. PORTER: Because it is of no value.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Is it not a possibility in the future it would be taken advantage of?

MR. PORTER: No, because in the larger districts often the high school and the vocational school enter into a high school district and you have a combined school where you have vocational courses in a high school. It is considered unnecessary.

MR. MILLARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, these reasons do not satisfy me. In looking at part three, it seemed to me that while it cannot be used very often or not at all that it did provide machinery for doing something that certain municipalities might find it to their advantage to do. Nothing the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) said on the several occasions he was on his feet has convinced me that this should be discarded as a dead branch. Perhaps it is a branch that should not be dead and unless he is able to add anything to what he said, unless he is able to say that there is some harm to be done by taking this machinery under which the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) on the application of certain boards may establish a vocational schools district and so on and enabling municipalities to contribute to the support of

that school, unless he is able to give some better reason than he has given so far I am opposed to the repeal of this part because on the face of it it appears there could be circumstances where it may be useful. In that case, I assume we would then have the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) coming back to the House and asking us to restore what is now a dead branch.

The hon. MINISTER (Mr. Porter) a moment ago referred to the growth of districts in which there are high schools and very frequently these are operated or built in conjunction with vocational schools. Why should that invariably be the case? Should that always be necessary? Are there no circumstances in which this machinery might not be the best machinery to utilize? I have not heard anything from the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) to show me why it should go.

MR. PORTER: Well, this was passed originally to meet a particular situation, Mimico, Long Branch, and New Toronto and they decided not to use it. Since 1931 it has not been used and we know of no other similar situation under which an application could be made and there is ample provision for the establishment of vocational schools under that legislation as it exists and we think it should be repealed.

MR. JOLLIFFE: How do we know some other municipalities may not want to use it? I would point out that the growth of these new urban municipalities which were former rural townships make it very likely you will need this in the next few years.

MR. PORTER: I appreciate the hon. Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Jolliffe) position and I am quite prepared to hold this Bill over a couple of days and find out the possibilities that have been raised by him and if there is any justification for retaining this section I would have no objection to it but so far, I understand, that there is none.

Motion stands.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister):

Order No. 27.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 27th Order, second readying of Bill No. 48, "An Act to Amend the Public Service Act", Mr. Welsh.

HON. G.A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 48, an "Act to Amend the Public Service Act".

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) whether the amendment meets with the approval of the Civil Service Association and whether it is in accordance with their request or whether it falls short of what they ask.

MR. WELSH: Mr. Speaker, actually this Bill is more administrative than a change in policy and it arises as a result of a meeting with the Civil Service Association.

(B-17 follows)

This amendment only affects 37 people in all and the amount of money involved is about $12,000. It is to clear up some loose ends in the administration. You can readily understand there are cases that occur that are very difficult to handle with regulations as they are and there are 37 of these cases where an injustice has been done, particularly to widows and it is to clear that up that the Civil Service Commissioner has brought in this amendment.

(Take C follows)

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): I have no objection to the Bill and to what it intends to accomplish. I welcome it. All I was wondering was whether the civil servants did not ask for a higher figure, whether that is in accordance with their request; that is all.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Is the government disturbed at all by the disclosure of the provincial auditor that your fund is not actuarially sound?

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): We have not lost any sleep over it.

MR. NIXON: You can always replenish your fund from the good old provincial treasury.

MR. C. C. CALDER (London): When the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) says 37 people are affected, does he mean beneficially?

Hon. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Yes.

MR. CALDER: How was this date arrived at? Were the date moved further back how many people would be benefitted? On what consideration is the date fixed at this particular point?

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, my understanding of this matter is just this, that the old maximum that applied for years in the civil service was $2,000. Later this was raised to $3,000 and now this take off the ceiling entirely. We have civil servants who have contributed for years to superannuation and when they reach $2,000 after that all of their contributions are for nothing. We have taken that off. We have raised the limit to $3,000 and now

we take off the limit altogether. We think that is justice for those people. When we came to look into this thing we placed the effective date asof the date of commencement, which was on the 1st October. Now, I think I am right---my hon. friend will tell me if I am right or not---that in going back we found that there were a handful of people who had been superannuated years before and who were suffering under this disability. Now we take the generous and humane position of removing that and paying it to those people who had retired in past years and who have made the contributions for greater amounts than the ceiling at that time allowed. That is the whole story of it.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Is that the group who number 37?

MR. FROST: That is right. There is about $16,000 involved.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The group which may be affected in the future is an intangible group; the group to be affected in future--

MR. FROST: We have no idea of the future. There is no limit to it. The ceiling is off and they get according to the amount they put in.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST: Order No. 28.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 28th Order, second reading of Bill No. 49, "An Act to amend the Municipal Act," Mr. Dunbar.

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 49 entitled "An Act to amend the Municipal Act."

MR. G. B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that there is a contradiction in the explanatory note here, compared to that of the amendment to the Act. As we read the explanatory note, it says:

> "Paragraph 63 authorizes the acquisition of land by local municipalities for lease or sale as industrial sites. This amendment is to ensure that monies received shall be applied to pay off the debentures and to other expenditures connected with the properties."

Actually what the amendment is doing is bringing about a greater degree of control of the financial responsibility of the municipality. In other words, I assume from the wording of the amendment that what the Department is trying to do is prevent a municipality from getting a windfall and having the few dollars that they have not budgeted for and using it for other purposes. I am heartily in accord with the idea that our muncipalities require a certain amount of control but I am also of the opinion that probably we are going too far with this control by the Department of Municipal Affairs; in fact, we have got to the point now it is a question of whether there is such a thing as local economy any more insofar as our municipalities are concerned. In fact, my experience is that with respect to municipal government we have not even the right to

comb our own hair without first consulting the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): He is no expert at that.

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Very nicely done today.

MR. ELLIS: I think we have gone one more step in removing some more localautonomy from our municipal council. It is just an example to what ridiculous stage this matter of control by the Department of Municipal Affairs over the municipalities has reached.

I will give you an example. I refer to my own city. Down there we have a great respect for churches and we do all we can to encourage the construction of churches. Now, I do not know in Ottawa whether they believe in that or not but we do down our way. For years, therefore, our municipality has seen fit to offer a 50% reduction of the appraised value of land acquired for the construction of churches. Now, we always thought that that was the very least any municipality could do to encourage the construction of churches for our people, and for years it was accepted by the Department. Then all of a sudden we got an order from the Department informing us that we can no longer continue to give any reduction in the appraised value of propery acquired for church purposes and churches would have to pay the full price, the full appraisal value. Now, I think that is going too far and I think the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) must agree with

me that some place or other the municipalities should have some rights. Certainly I am sure we do not assume that the members of all our municipal councils are quite incapable of running the affairs of their communities, that they have to be entirely dependent upon the decisions of the Department, here. As I said before, I agree that we have to have a fair measure of control in respect of the financial situation of our municipalities, but I want to draw to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affair's (Mr. Dunbar) attention that he has already gone too far in respect to controlling such small things as subsidies with respect to churches and stopping windfalls, which I think this Act is intended to do. There are some councils who could get a small windfall today from the sale of some properties, who have local plans for improvements of services, and surely why should they not go out and spend a few dollars for which they have not budgeted? The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) says "No." That is a peculiar thing. I stand to be corrected, but I think that at the present time under the regulation of the Department all municipalities are working under a plan whereby they have to set aside a certain sum of money every year for debt retirement; in other words, practically all the municipalities in the Province of Ontario today have drafted plans of debt reduction and they have to assess every year a certain portion of their mill rate for debt retirement purposes and it is not necessary to take every nickel which comes along and apply it for

that purpose. Again I say let us somehow or other determine where local economy begins and where it stops with respect to our municipalities and the Department of Municipal Affairs.

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I am quite amused with the statements made by the hon. member from Windsor (Mr. Ellis). I have a recollection of the church in question, which you mention. I think the hon. member (Mr. Ellis) does realize and does know that, Windsor being under supervision at one time, when the refinancing went through, all vacant land was pledged in the refinancing of retired debentures and that no land could be disposed of without the Department of Municipal Affairs okaying that as well, and therefore this is what I said, that you should sell that land to the church and we have no control over you if you want to grant that money back to the church; but, in order to carry out our pledge to the purchasers of debentures in refinancing that you sell at the assessed price, then it is up to you to make your grant to the church. Return the money to them if you wish. We have no control over it. You can do that.

Since you were just putting me on the spot, I will put you on the spot.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DUNBAR: Last year when your council applied to me to give an o.k. to a private individual, building a home without any guarantee what the price of that home would be to the purchaser, what his profit would be in any way, my okay

on lots at $1 with all the services on. Do you think that should be allowed? Nevertheless, you made the request to transfer to this real estate man real estate with all improvements for one dollar per lot. Now, I wonder what the people of the Province of Ontario would think; I wonder what the bondholders who refinanced your debt would think they left it to the Department to see that the assessed value was left the property. You people suggested one dollar. If it had been a project such as you were carrying on, with the muncipalities of the Province of Ontario and the Federal Government, that might be a different thing, but this was a private builder who could sell his home for any price he liked and the poor man would have to pay what he requested for the house and you are willing to hand him all of the land for one dollar and you think then the Department should not have that control. It is too bad to think that the Department has not more control over things of that nature. This is not requiring anything out of reason at all; it is merely this, say Scarboro, or Etobicoke---it does not matter what municipality it is-- has permission to come to me and ask about land for industrial purposes, ask about purchasing land, then they may issue debentures for ten years and sixty days later they might sell that land for double what they paid for it. Their services which they have contracted to put on that land to get industry in there have not been paid for, the debenture is outstanding, the ratepayers will have to pay that over ten years and you would

say that they should be allowed to take that $10,000 and throw it in the pot and reduce the tax rate this year. Therefore the taxpayer would be paying this year's taxes over a period of ten years. It would not do at all. If municipalities throughout the province knew that this was being carried on they would think that our Department did not amount to very much if we did not have some control. I do not think you can find one municipality in the Province of Ontario whose representatives in this House will say that we have been unreasonable in this at all. Never in any case have we not been able to reach a reasonable agreement. I feel sure we will be in this case, because if they have a debenture for $10,000 and they sell for $20,000,

we want to put $10,000 in that pot and keep it so that it will retire that debenture so that the ratepayers will not be called upon from year to year to levy for that amount. There is nothing unreasonable in it. They can do what they wish with the balance but we wish to see that the ratepayer is protected. That is the main object. So far as taking any local autonomy away from the municipalities is concerned, everybody here knows this government has not taken any local autonomy away from the municipalities. Where is it taken away?

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): The Police Bill, the Fire Bill.

MR. DUNBAR: Does it say what they have to do with the money? It does not say to the municipality "You must apply this to the fire department, you must apply it on the police department.

You can put it in your general fund. You just spoke out of turn there. It does not say at all what they have to do with the money. They can do what they wish with it. They can use it for relief---anything at all. That is just a grant given but it is figured on whatit cost them for police and services and so forth of that kind.

MR. J. D. BROWN (Waterloo North): Did I understand the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) to say that it would only be proceeds from the sale or lease of properties against which debentures were outstanding, that this money was to be placed in a special account, or does it apply to proceeds from the sale of property irrespective of whether there are debentures against it or not?

MR. DUNBAR: That was the intention. If that is not clear enough, I would be very willing to have this changed by way of amendments. I am not a lawyer; I leave it to the law clerks. I know what I expect them to say. Whether it is not made clear enough, I do not know. I would be very willing to have any amendment made, because that is the intention, that the money would be placed in an account. It could be used for retiring debentures; it could be used for purchasing further land for the same purpose or it could be used for servicing that land. It could be used for those three things. If they indicated at the same time to the Department that they are selling the land and "we would like to use this money to purchase more land for industrial purposes," that is all right; well and good.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): May I say

this, that the note says this amendment is to enable that the monies received shall be applied to pay off debentures and other expenditures connected with the property. The Section says that "all monies received from the sale or lease of lands acquired under---so and so---shall be paid into a special account and such monies shall not be expended, pledged or applied to any purpose without approval of the Department". The wording of the Section is different from the explanatory note. Now, if I understand the matter, my hon. friend means the Section be the same as the explanatory note; in other words, if there is a debenture issued, that the monies should apply, .. which we all agree is reasonable. If there are no debentures I think the municipality should take any little profit there is on it. I do not see any difference.

Might I suggest this, if this is allowed to go into Committee that section could be amended to meet that situation.

MR. C. C. CALDER (London): May I suggest, through you, to the law clerks, that they consider before the committee stage is reached, changing the final wording to say instead of "any purpose without approval of the Department," to "such purposes as recommended by the municipality and as might be approved by the Department."

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): I was also going to suggest that it be reconsidered.

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR: (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Pardon?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I was also going to suggest that the wording of the amendment be reconsidered.

Our position has been, very briefly, that we are in favor of the explanation, the explanatory note. We were not at all sure whether we were in favor of the Bill. We could not very well vote for the explanatory note when we might be obliged to oppose the Bill. The Bill does not say anythingabout debentures at all.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): 29th Order.

THE DAY NURSERIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 29th Order, second reading of Bill No. 50, "An Act to amend the Day Nurseries Act," Mr. Goodfellow.

Hon. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of Bill No. 50, entitled, "An Act to amend the Day Nurseries Act."

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): On this Bill--

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Too fast on the draw.

MR. JOLLIFFE: On a point of order, it seems to me, with great respect to the members of all groups attending the Session this afternoon---my own group and others--- on second reading, without being too inflexible about it, we should observe the rule. We should try to refrain from questions and rambling discussions in which the hon. Minister concerned speaks half a dozen times. I think the hon. Minister concerned ought to give the

reasons, if there are any, in favor of the principle of the Bill and hon. members should speak for or against the Bill with, perhaps, some slight leeway if essential, at this point. I say this with respect to everybody who has made a contribution this afternoon and with appreciation for your tolerance, I do think that the hon. Minister concerned ought to have the floor on the Bill in the first instance---and I would almost be prepared to suggest that unless he takes the floor and justifies his Bill we ought to turn it down.

Hon. W. A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): I quite agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) in the expression he has made. I think I was just possibly a little slow getting up. Someone else was just a bit quicker in this instance.

Mr. Speaker, as I explained in introducing the Bill, the purpose of this amendment is to provide for a group of children who at the present time cannot qualify for day nursery care, that is, as far as the provincial participation in the Act is concerned. They include a group of pre-school children and also those who are attending kindergarten. A great many children attending kindergarten can only attend for a part of a day and it is felt it would be of assistance to the mothers if we would extend the Act through this amendment to take care of all pre-school children and also those in kindergarten up to the point where they are in full attendance, that is, in attendance at school for the full period of the school hours.

Mr. Speaker, that is the purpose of this amendment.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): The hon. Prime Minister is making me very self conscious and very hesitant to say anything when I see another member on his feet or I may be accused of being fast on the draw.

I think that this Bill is a step forward and as such is welcome but I suggest that it is not going far enough; and I suggest further that there have been requests made by very responsible bodies to the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) for the extension of the age limit to eight years and that the provincial government share the costs up to that age limit. When I say "responsible bodies" I am referring to such bodies as the Welfare Department of the City of Toronto.

The Commissioner of Public Welfare only yesterday spoke about this matter and he was very specific on it, very clear. I am sorry that I have not the clipping from yesterday's paper with me, but, as I recall the statement as quoted in the press, the Welfare Commissioner said that seven years is not old enough and will not be of any great assistance to the city of Toronto, especially having regard to its present financial difficulties to provide adequate accommodation for the nursery, and that if the government were to assume responsibility for its share of responsibility up to the age of eight years that would meet all of the requirements.

Now, I do not think that the cost would be prohibitive for the province. I think that the provincial exchequer

is in excellent condition and I can think of very few cases where money could be spent more usefully and more advantageously than in this field by helping municipalities to finance the day nurseries. I know it is a matter which calls for the expenditure of money, and a private member cannot even move an amendment to this Bill, otherwise I would certainly move an amendment to change the figure again from seven to eight years; but, I do want to appeal to the government to consider this plea of the city of Toronto and perhaps of other municipalities, and certainly of welfare organizations, and meet them as fully as possible by increasing the age limit to eight years.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) that, while I have no hesitation in supporting the amendment, there are certain developments because of circumstances which exist in the day in which we are living, which causes it to seem to me that the restriction of being in the first grade of school ought to be removed. I think that there are a great many cases where we will be most anxious to have women in industry. Now, it may very well mean that if we set an arbitrary age of seven or the fact that a child isgoing to school, so they cannot get supplementary day nursery care, it may mean that certain women will have to leave their employment in order to take care of their children.

I think we ought to provide for these contingencies and look ahead a little bit. I do not know why we need to

keep this restriction. I think it is a step forward to advance the age to seven but why put on this restriction? I think children mostly start to school at the age of six, particularly in the urban centres, and I do not see why it could not be amended to take out the school provision and to advance it to eight years, if necessary or where circumstances warrant that it might be advanced to eight years of age.

If we want to play our part and cooperate I think we ought to make these regulations flexible enough that these matters could be taken care of rather than to have restrictions which, in many circumstances, will cause day nursery people, themselves, to step in and take action, where otherwise they would meet the situation under the circumstances involved. I think there ought to be a little more flexibility, and, while I agree on the amendment, I would like to see it reconsidered and some of the restriction further relaxed so that we can take care of eventualities and all contingencies over the next period of time.

(Take D follows)

MR. GOODFELLOW: Mr. Speaker, the purpose, of course, of this Act is to cover the situation up until the first year of the grade school. There is a principle involved there. You will appreciate that the purpose of the Day Nursery is to take care of Pre-School children. I am not concerned whether they are seven or eight years of age, but it is the principle which is involved, and they will be taken care of up to the time they enter the first grade of school.

Of course, once we go beyond that, we would have to consider some other policy, as to whether we should assist the municipalities in regard to day nurseries, where, as in a case during the war, mothers were required to work to a much greater degree.

I think there has been a misunderstanding on the part of a great many people with respect to the day nurseries, and the Day Care Centers, and as to where the dividing line exist, and the purpose of this amendment is to make sure every child is taken care of up to the time they are in full attendance at the school.

Motion agreed; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 34.

THE ADOPTION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 34th Order; second reading of Bill No. 51, "An Act to amend the Adoption Act", Mr. Goodfellow.

HON. W.A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 51, "An Act to amend the Adoption Act".

Mr. Speaker, we have given this matter a good deal of consideration, and the facts that we are suggesting in this amendment have been introduced in many jurisdictions, and seemed to be working out quite satisfactorily, and we see no reason why the probationary period, from the time the child is taken into the home until the order is granted, should extend beyond one year. As a matter of fact, we did give consideration to reducing it to six months, but after consideration we thought that for a preliminary trial, we would make it one year.

MR. WILLIAM TEMPLE (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) for the introduction of this Bill. It seems to me that one year is ample time to determine the [illegible] an applicant to adopt a child. In reducing it from two years to one year, I think he is doing the right thing, and showing good, sound sense.

MR. C.H. MILLARD ((York West): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) what the experience is in States where they have made it six months? I know the hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) and I were dealing with a case which included Florida, and there was a sixth month's rule down there. What is the experience? Is six months not enough? Does it require a year?

MR. GOODFELLOW: I think in replying to the question by the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard),

I quite well recall the occasion when we had a discussion on this case, which I will admit was very involved.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, from information we have, we thought that possibly six months would be adequate, but we thought it better for the time being to leave it at one year.

As pointed by the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Temple) one year should be ample time to ascertain whether the home is a proper home and the people are the proper people to adopt a child.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Just a question, Mr. Speaker. My curiosity is aroused. Does the explanatory note mean that you do not cease to be an infant until you attain the age of 21?

MR. GOODFELLOW: That is right.

MR. MacLEOD: You are an infant until you are 21?

MR. GOODFELLOW: That is right. It extends longer than that, to some.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 35.

THE PLANNING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 35th Order, second reading of Bill No. 53, "An Act to amend the Planning Act," Mr. Griesinger.

HON. WILLIAM GRIESINGER (Minister of Planning and Development): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 53: "An Act to amend the Planning Act".

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the explanatory note of Section 1 that "The present wording is inflexible in that it states that the initial terms of office shall be definitely one year, two years and three years. This has been questioned by the solicitors of a number of municipalities, in view of the fact that it is desirable that the annual appointment of members of the planning board should be made at the same time as other annual municipal appointments are made, which is normally in the month of January."

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I have a cold, so if the hon. members do not quite understand me, I will try to do better.

In connection with Section 2, two features which are essential to the success of an official plan are:

"(1) that the plan shall not be recommended and adopted until there is assurance that, as a result of thorough study, acceptable solutions have been found, and

(2) that, a plan having been adopted, its proposals will be progressively implemented without change until its benefits have been fully realized."

That has been requested by the members of the Planning Board.

Now, in regard to Section 3:

"In order to ensure the second requisite of an official plan, i.e., that it shall be retained in effect until such time as its provisions can be completely and satisfactorily implemented, it is necessary that no plan shall be repealed or amended except as the result of careful study and consideration, equivalent to that on which the original plan was based and an assurance that the proposed changes are the result of a definite and permanent desire of the people affected as indicated by their elected representatives.

Precedent for this type of enactment is contained in section 226 (5) of The Municipal Act, where it is provided that the council shall not without a two-thirds vote reverse or vary the action of the board of control in respect of certain specified matters."

And in regard to section 4, in addition to the explanatory note, "Minister's orders of the type referred to would be mostly in respect of unorganized territory in Northern Ontario in which, as you know, there are no municipal councils. Consequently if there is to be any restraint in the sale of land by leaps and bounds description as is provided by Section 24 of The Planning Act, it will have to be by Minister's order and again, if there is to be any control of land uses it will have to be also by Minister's order.

However, there have been in the past and in all likelihood will be in the future, cases in which a Minister's order will be requested by a Council of a local municipality as a freezing order pending action by the Council.

As the section reads at the moment the Minister would be barred from issuing an order to stop the selling of land by leaps and bounds in areas already covered by a zoning by-law. It has been agreed between ourselves, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and his officials and Mr. Treadgold, legal counsel, that there should be no such bar."

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the remarks of the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) on this amendment to the Planning Act. But I regret that he has not made the amendment just a little stronger.

MR. GRIESINGER: Which one is that?

MR. DENNISON: I regret he has not made the amendment referred to in Section 4 a little stronger.

I will tell you why. At the present time, the planning authority or planning department in a municipality must act either under Section 24 of The Planning Act, or Section 390 of the Municipal Act, and if there is already in the municipality in the area, it bars them from acting under Section 390 of The Municipal Act, which has all the powers necessary, and, therefore, they must act under the weaker section, section 24 of The Planning Act.

Let us take for an example, the Don Valley Authority. We were over to see the magnificent display they had there the other evening, and we agree with their objectives, I am sure, but in the Don Valley they are not legally able to prevent an objectionable use of land, a use against the object of the plan, unless they

expropriate the land.

Of course, they have no funds to expropriate the land at the moment, and they are to some extent helpless to prevent them being sold and used for purposes which will ultimately destroy the operation of the plan.

To give you an example; Section 390 of The Municipal Act also has a weakness, as the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) will recall. If a person wants to occupy land in the district with an objectionable use, such as a junk yard, or an objectionable manufacturing establishment, and wants to establish it in a residential area - once established it is impossible to oust them, unless the municipality is prepared to expropriate the land, and naturally they do not want to do that.

So I would suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) my regret that this Section does not further strenghten the powers of the planning authorities in the Province, and that The Planning Act is not further strengthened.

I am very happy that the Hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) continues to give himself power under Section 24. I think that is necessary, but I think Section 24 is pretty weak.

I also wondered why you withdrew the penalty of $500.00 if they do not obey you? You have removed the penalty, and will not these people completely ignore the Department of Planning and Development, with the penalty removed? I cannot see why it should be removed.

And while I am on my feet, I would like to urge the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) to take a step of this nature.

A few years ago, as we all know, there was a beautiful golf course in the East End of Toronto, the Cliffside Golf Course, one of the most beautiful sites in Ontario.

Now, then, that Cliffside Golf Course has been sold for building purposes -

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): What about Snake Island?

MR. DENNISON: I never heard about Snake Island until yesterday.

That beautiful site will be built up, and the opportunity for having a beauty spot for this whole area will be lost.

The City of Toronto was powerless to act, because the land was in a different municipality.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) might take action, if it is not too late, and I would suggest he still act and reclaim this land along the Bluffs.

It is dangerous to build houses there. The Bluffs are continually falling down, and the people who purchase the land will ultimately be washed into the lake. It can only be used for a beauty spot, and I urge the hon. Minister (Mr. Greisinger) to exercise his authority and preserve the beauty spots of this kind, when the municipality cannot act.

MR. GRIESINGER: I appreciate the remarks of the hon. Member for St. David (Mr. Dennison), and I

believe he has made some good suggestions. I would ask if he cares to sometimes during the following week to come over to the office and have a further discussion with myself and the Director of the branch. We would appreciate it very much.

In connection with the penalty; I see it still remains in the original Act, under Section 25, sub-section 3.

MR. CAMPBELL CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, there is no single principle running through this Bill, so I trust you will excuse me.

We more or less rule out Sections 1 and 3 as unobjectionable, and may I enquire of the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) if he [illegible] think he is likely to run into real, practical difficulties with section 2 as it now stands, where he will not get his plan approved unless the majority of all members of the Planning Board concur in it? I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) what his experience is with the Planning Board, in general.

MR. GRIESINGER: There is a possibility of that, but that has been more or less requested by the municipalities, that it be a two-thirds vote of the Planning Board. I will be glad to look into it further, but we do not expect to experience any trouble.

MR. CALDER: From my limited experience, Mr. Speaker, I will wager there will be trouble on this ground, that your Planning Board is bound to be so representative that it is only on rare occasion when you can get the majority of all the members of the Board.

In London we have trouble at times scraping up a quorum. Perhaps that is because we get on so well with the township, that we do not have everybody at the meetings.

I think we should seriously consider this point, as I think you will find difficulty there. I think a simple majority of any quorum would be sufficient.

MR. GRIESINGER: Sometimes the quorum is very small, and it may be all composed of Council members. We want a two-thirds majority of the members of the Planning Board.

MR. CALDER: Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) that in the three years I have been sitting on the London and Suburban Planning Board, that the mayor and two aldermen from the City Council have not been at a meeting of The Planning Board altogether.

However, let experience take care of that.

The second point is much more important, in connection with sub-section 4. I just want to have the assurance of the hon.Minister (Mr. Griesinger) that what he has said about the collaboration between his Department and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar), if he will not use his extraordinary powers, which may be necessary in Northern Ontario, without first giving due consideration to it himself, and then consulting with his honourable colleague.

MR. J.L. EASTON (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I concur in the idea that a majority would be better.

In the City of Hamilton there is almost a deadlock over the prospect of developing the airport as a housing site, and the Planning Board was tied on this question. It has gone to the Board of Control, which is sending it on to Council, and it seems to me it is a desirable thing that The Planning Board should, by a simple majority, decide what should be done.

In Hamilton, we have had to reduce the number on the Planning Board, because it was difficult to get a quorum, so I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Griesinger) should reconsider that Section, and when he realizes that the Board of Control and the Council also must approve, there seems to be ample protection, even when a major step is taken.

(PAGE D-12 FOLLOWS)

MR. GRIESINGER: I understand your difficulty in Hamilton, but the matter of the airport is satisfactorily looked after.

MR. EASTON: It is difficult at times to get a majority of all the members, when they do not turn up at a meeting.

MR. GRIESINGER: We will be glad to consider that.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

MR. FROST: 36th Order.

THE MINING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 36th Order, second reading of Bill No. 54, "An Act to amend the Mining Act," Mr. Gemmell.

Hon. W. S. GEMMELL (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 54, "An Act to amend the Mining Act."

This amendment to the Mining Act, Mr. Speaker, is being brought in to take care of a problem with regard to sand and gravel and surface deposits of some value, whether they are staked or unstaked, and in respect to land where the owner has a full title.

At the present time, in the mining areas, particularly in Northern Ontario, there are large construction programs going on, and also the question of the back-fill for the mining operations.

I believe it was back in 1939 that the Act was brought in to provide for the staking of claims which would get the gravel deposits.

This will clarify that matter, and it has been felt at this time that some method should be brought in to make sand and gravel available for these purposes, and also for the government to draw revenue from the same, under this Act, and also there is the question of the availability of a large gravel deposit, where the mining department could operate, in respect to the Mines Inspection Act.

It will also cover the deposits of felspar and limestone. It would not be necessary or desirable for an individual to go through the process of staking a claim, and bringing it to patent rights, to get these deposits. With the surface deposits, it is not necessary to drill, or do all the work, to find out what is there. In this case we will licence them, and charge them on a royalty basis, according to the value of the product.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

(Take E follows)

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) has a couple of matters of public importance upon which he would like to make some comment.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, this morning I had an interview with the Mayor of London in my office in which the circumstances were fully discussed which resulted in his dismissal from the police force in London some months ago. As the House no doubt will recall, the dismissed constable then ran for Mayor and was elected by a large majority. After discussing with the Mayor the various aspects of the case for the first time this morning he asked me whether I would be willing to institute an inquiry, which I am authorized to do under section 46 of the Police Act into the circumstances surrounding his dismissal. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is the view of this government that in all matters of this kind where some apparent obscurity exists and where possibly some injustice may have been done, that the fullest possible light should be thrown upon the whole question and therefore following this meeting with Mayor Rush this morning and at his request I have ordered an enquiry into the facts surrounding the dismissal. I might say that the hon. Mr. Justice Roach has consented to act in this enquiry and consequently under the authority of the Police Act that appointment has been made. It is expected the enquiry will proceed at the earliest convenient date.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: There is one other matter, Mr. Speaker, to which I would like to make reference. In the Daily Star this evening on page 22 there is an item containing the following headline "Detroit Gaming Raids Made Possible By New Windsor Regime---Chief." Now, in reading this article the only reference made at all to the new regime in Windsor ---

MR. JOLLIFFE: Which one?

MR. PORTER: Well, reading from the headline, I do not know any more than what they say in the headline, the only reference in the text is the following paragraph:

> "Commissioner Boos said it was only because of the full cooperation of the law authorities in Windsor, who had succeeded the ousted officials of last year, that the Detroit police were able to get evidence that led to gambling raids in December."

Apparently it was because of the cooperation he got that they were able to act and I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that that seems to be entirely inconsistent with the large headline that appears.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in moving adjournment of the House I might say that we would like on Monday to go ahead with the second reading of Bills. Apparently there are still quite a list to go through, and if we cut down the list of second readings on government orders on Monday we would be very happy indeed. Among

the Bills considered will be, of course, the Workmen's Co ensation Bill upon which the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) expressed some interest and asked it to be held until Monday. On Tuesday we will go ahead with the Throne debate.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3.57 of the clock p. m.

- - -

ONTARIO

Third Session
of the
Twenty-Third Legislature
of the
Province of Ontario

0

Toronto, Ontario, February 12, 1951, et seq.

0

Volume VIII

Monday, February 12, 1951.

0

HON. (Rev.) M. C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R. C. Sturgeon
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
Toronto

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

Hon- (Rev.) M. C. Davies, Speaker

Volume VIII

Monday, February 12, 1951

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: It is always my pleasure to welcome students from various schools into the Assembly for our sessions. Today, we are particularly pleased to welcome a group from Sudbury. I think that represents the farthest distance any students have come to our city so we are more than happy to welcome the students from Sudbury and district at our sitting this afternoon.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

HOURS OF WORK AND VACATIONS WITH PAY ACT

MR. J.G. BROWN (Waterloo, North): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Calder, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend The Hours of Work and Vacations With Pay Act", and that same be now read the first time.

MR. R. THORNBERRY (Hamilton, Centre): Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member (Mr. Brown) explain?

MR. BROWN: This Bill is to provide for two weeks vacation with pay after the first year's employment and also after two years for credit with vacation pay stamps on the same basis.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

THE INSURANCE ACT.

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York, West): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Miss Macphail, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Amend the Insurance

Act", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

CITY OF BELLEVILLE

MR. W.E. SANDERCOCK (Hastings, West): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Fullerton, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act Respecting the City of Belleville Bus Franchise", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

TOWN OF MALTON

MR. A.A. MACKENZIE (York, North): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Hall, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act to Incorporate the town of Malton", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

CONGREGATION OF ANSHE-SHOLEM OF HAMILTON

MR. A.A. MACKENZIE (York, North): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, in the absence of Mr. Hall, seconded by myself, that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, "An Act Respecting the Jewish Congregation of Anshe-Sholem of Hamilton", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

DIOCESE OF ONTARIO AND ST. THOMAS

MR. W.E. SANDERCOCK (Hastings, West): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Fullerton, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, " An Act Respecting the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Ontario and St. Thomas Church, Belleville", and that the same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

(Page A-4 follows)

DIOCESE OF OTTAWA

MR. J. G. WHITE (Kenora): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Morrow, I move, seconded by Mr. Mackenzie, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled, "An Act respecting the incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Ottawa", and that same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table answers to questions 9 and 22.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 37.

THE TRAINING SCHOOLS ACT

THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 37th Order, second reading Bill No. 58, an Act to Amend The Training Schools Act, Mr. Foote.

Hon. J. W. FOOTE (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 58, "An Act to Amend The Training Schools Act". Section 1 of this Bill increases the liability of municipalities for the maintenance and education of children in training schools. The increase is from seventy-five cents a day to ninety cents. This is one of a series of amendments made from time to time having regard to increased costs. Section 2 provides an increase to the contribution of the Province for the maintenance and education of children in private schools, bringing the amount up to $1.80 a day.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Foote) would tell us if there has not been a typographical error in the first word

of the new Part One. It says: "Subject". Should that not be "Except as in this Act may otherwise be provided"?

MR. FROST: It sounds logical. Could you hold that for committee?

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 40.

CHANGE OF NAME ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 40th Order, second reading Bill No. 71, "An Act to Amend the Change of Name Act", Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 71, "An Act to Amend the Change of Name Act". I outlined on first reading, this amendment is intended to bring the Change of Name Act into line with The Canadian Citizenship Act passed recently by the Federal Parliament and also with the amendment of recent years authorizing married women to apply under the Act. This would bring the Act into line with the present legal position not only as to The Canadian Citizenship Act but as to that particular difficulty arising out of the present Change of Name Act so as to permit the use of either a naturalization or citizenship certificate. Then, there is a further amendment which arises out of the Federal Bankruptcy Act, Section 3 of the amending Bill covers that situation.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 41.

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 41st Order, second reading of Bill No. 72, "An Act to Amend The Board of Education Act", Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education); Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 72, "An Act to Amend The Board of Education Act".

(Page A-7 follows)

This Bill is for the purpose of amending the Statutes to clarify the number of members which a County Council may appoint to a municipal Board of Education. It provides that the representation shall be the same as under The High Schools Act, that is, at least one representative, or three at the request of the Board. It would also provide that union Boards of Education can be formed only for the boundaries of a high school district and a public school section coincide. It is essential that the board be dissolved when the areas cease to coincide, and it would be improper to permit the existing high school and public school board members to continue in office, as is now the case where a normal dissolution is effected, because their jurisdictional area would be different. This is merely to bring the Act into line with the practice which is considered effective in design.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order Number 42.

THE CONTINUATION SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-second order, second reading Bill number 73, "An Act to Amend The Continuation Schools Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill number 73, "An Act to Amend the Continuation Schools Act". This amendment clarifies the procedures where a high school district absorbs a continuation school district, and the methods of settling the disposition of the assets and liabilities of the continuation school. It also provides for the continuance of the continuation school board until all assets,

liabilities and property are disposed of.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Forty-third order.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-third order, second reading Bill number 74, "An Act to Amend the Public Schools Act", Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill number 74, "An Act to Amend the Public Schools Act".

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (York, South): Mr. Speaker, does the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) know when these Bills were distributed? My information is they were not distributed until this morning. I am sure the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) will agree it is hardly fair to move second reading.

MR. PORTER: If the Bills have been distributed as recently as that, I definitely do not intend to press them at all.

MR. FROST: I would say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) [illegible]

We have difficulty, of course, in having printing done and we would be perfectly willing on any of these matters, if it is so stated, not to regard the matter of the passage of the principle as being really fundamental and we could reconsider the matters in committee if that would not embarrass the hon. Members opposite.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That means, Mr. Speaker, that we have to take the responsibility of acquiescing or objecting when we are not really in a position to know whether

we can take that responsibility. I had noticed that there are a good many Bills on the order paper which are ready for the committee stage and I had anticipated that is what we would be doing today. I am not trying to advise the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) what he should do but I must say again I do not think it is right to place us in a position where we have to acquiesce in the passage of a Bill when we have not yet decided whether there is a principal involved which we wish to contest. If we knew, of course, perhaps we could give our view but we do not know when they have been so recently distributed.

MR. FROST: Of course, it is my intention to go ahead with the Workmens' Compensation Bill and there are one or two which I think have been on the Order Paper for some little time. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) thinks they should be held over I will do it. If he feels they could go into committee, then, that may be done.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You see the difficulty, I do not know and since I do not know, I am obliged to say I do not think they should get into second reading today.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed, that the only Bill on the list for second reading -- there are three Bills on the list for second reading that have been distributed since last week. One is the Boilers Act and The Workmens Compensation is one and --

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is the other way around, just reverse yourself. We have seen The Workmens Compensation Act in print since sometime last week and have had an opportunity to study it, but that is not so of the Bills which follow, orders number 40 or 41 .

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to argue about this matter because if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has not had an opportunity of seeing these Bills and there is any question about it, we do not propose to embarrass the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) by asking him to say"yes"or"no"to a Bill that he has not had an opportunity of reading. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has not seen the Bills, that is sufficient for us.

MR. FROST: Very well we will go on with the others.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order number 38.

THE WORKMENS COMPENSATION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirty eighth order, second reading Bill number 66, "An Act to Amend The Workmens Compensation Act", Mr. Daley.

Hon. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labor): Mr. Speaker, before moving second reading of Bill number 66, I must say I do not know whether I am entirely in order but I have an amendment that I would like to include in this Bill in the committee stage. It is a simple amendment but it is an amendment of some importance too. It is to be moved as soon as section seven of Bill number 66 is carried in Committee and it is to amend the Workmens Compensation Act by adding the following section which will be section 67 A: "Subject to the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, the Board -- "

Meaning The Workmens Compensation B oard; "may purchase or otherwise acquire such real property as it deems necessary for its purposes and may with like

approval sell or otherwise dispose of other such property."

The desirability of this amendment is the fact that The Compensation Board now operate the clinic at Malton and there are a number of buildings there which they operate but do not own and because of the inadequacy of our present quarters we are in a process of building a new building and it is felt that The Workmens Compensation Board rather than pay rent for these properties should own them. They should have the right to own their own properties and administer their own affairs. We are now in the Canada Life Building paying a very large rent for property that is not adequate for our purposes. This amendment, as I have stated, will come up in committee and I wanted to inform you that this was to be added.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It does not sound very contentious.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Nor important.

(TAKE "B" FOLLOWS)

MR. DALEY: Now, I would like before introducing the Bill for second reading to say a few words --

MR. A.A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, may I suggest the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) is not in order. There is nothing before us. He should move second reading, before he speaks.

MR. DALEY: Mr. Speaker, I accept the suggestion by my hon. friend, (Mr. MacLeod), and I now move second reading of Bill No. 66, "An Act to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act".

Thank you. The hon. Member for Bellwods (Mr. MacLeod) is a little technical today.

MR. MacLEOD: I wanted to keep [illegible] in order.

MR. DALEY: I want to speak for the moment in regard to the Malton Rehabilitation Center, and I would like to say that I would think it very essential that the hon. members of this Legislature make a point, during this Session, -- and I promise every assistance -- to visit the Malton Rehabilitation Center.

I know it is not possible for all the hon. members of the Legislature to go at the same time, but if I could be acquainted with the information as to when they will be able to go, I will be very happy to provide transportation. I would suggest 10:30 in the morning, and I should like to have 30 or 35 members, so we could utilize a bus, take them out and inspect the center, see what is going on out there, and have luncheon, and return here by, say, one o'clock.

As you may know, people come from all parts of the world to see the operation of this clinic, and I think it is most regrettable that a goodly number of our own hon.

members sitting in this Legislature, to whom it is so important, have not as yet visited the Center. So I would ask you to communicate with me and give me the information as to when you will be able to go.

I know there are meetings of Committees, some mornings, which some of the hon. members have to attend, while others do not, and I could easily arrange to have the facilities to take a group out there, and I hope that before this Session ends every hon. member will have an opportunity of really inspecting the Center.

In order to provide the injured work-people of this Province with the best medical services known to science, and also the best rehabilitation program yet devised, and to get away from practices formerly in effect in this Province and still in effect in most of the other Provinces and States of that great country to the south of us; where an injured workman who has suffered some degree of permanent disability is more or less left on his own, I had this Government through the Department of Public Works, purchase some fifteen buildings at Malton, which were formerly the No. 1 Air Observors' School of the R.C.A.F., and turned them over to the Workmen's Compensation Board so they could carry out my thoughts in seeing that nowhere on this universe, would injured work-people receive better services than in this Province of Ontario.

At present we have 494 patients at the Centre, and in the three and a half years of operation, over 10,000 workers have benefited from treatment here. I should point out to the Members of the House, that these 10,000 or better injured workmen who have been at Malton, received full compensation

during the period they were there, and in addition are supplied with meals and housing and free stage plays and moving pictures at the Theatre on the premises. In other words, these 10,000 work-people receive better than 100% compensation while at this centre, 75% of their wages which is tax free, plus room and board etc. The operation of the hospital section alone, where we have men who. were they not here, would be treated in the General Hospitals, has saved us over $200,000 in treatment outlay.

We find that to operate this type of Centre, we need one staff member to each two patients. In a General Hospital the ratio is 1.2 to 1.5 staff to each patient. The patients are well housed, well fed, well treated, and there are adequate facilities for recreation, including picture shows, library, billiard rooms, etc. Each patient has an active treatment program laid down by the doctors, which includes physiotherapy, occupational therapy, and remedial exercises supervised by our remedial gymnasts.

It is impossible to give accurate figures to show the beneficial results of this program, but we know that in practically all cases the workers' length of disability and amount of disability have been reduced through treatment here. The Rehabilitation Officers follow each case through to suitable placement in industry, so that the spirit of the Act is maintained. Everything possible is done to assure the best medical care to the injured worker so that he may become as well as possible, as quickly as possible, and returned to take his proper place as a useful member of society.

It is interesting to note that in spite of steadily

increasing prices, and without reducing the adequacy of our services in any way, the per patient cost per day in 1950, was only two cents higher than the cost in 1949.

Six American training colleges, as well as our local University, use our facilities for training students. The United Nations, the Government of the United States and the Rockefeller Foundation, have sent many interested visitors from all parts of the World to study our operations, and it is generally conceded that this operation is unique on the North American Continent.

We admitted 3524 injured work-people in 1950, and in the same period 3495 were discharged to their homes and back to various jobs of work. The average length of stay in the entire Convalescent Centre was 41 days, and in the Clinic and Physical Medicine Section, the average was 26 days.

In our hospital section of the Centre, we had 55,808 patient days in the year 1950, while in the Clinic section the number was 89,361. The total operating cost of this centre for the year 1950 was $764,913.22, giving an average daily cost per patient of $5.26. It costs the Board an average of $7.50 per day per patient, in the Active Hospitals of this Province.

To operate this institution we have a staff of 199 made up of a Superintendent, a Director of Medical Services, an Assistant Director of Medical Services, 5 duly qualified medical officers, 15 registered nurses, 21 occupational therapists 20 physiotherapists, 6 remedial gymnasts, 2 radiologists, 10 nursing assistants, 13 ward aides, 13 orderlies, 20 on the

administration staff, 1 cost accountant, a Rehabilitation Officer and 2 assistants, and 67 on the maintenance staff.

Ontario workmen coming under the Provision of the Compensation Act are entitled to full and complete Medical Aid, necessary as a result of their injury, and also to artificial members and apparatus and dental apppliances, and to have same kept in repair or replaced when deemed necessary.

As far as we can tell, there is no other Province in this Dominion, and no State in the Unionto the South, that offers to the injured workmen the facilities for medical and surgical care to the same degree that is offered in Ontario.

The Board gives the injured workmen the choice of Doctor, at the time of the accident, but if it is felt that the severity of his injury warrants the services of a Specialist in any particular l[illegible], or the facilities of a larger hospital than where the injured workman is located, the Board will arrange for transferring the workman.

When severe injuries occur in out-of-the-way places and highly-skilled services are shown to be necessary, the Board has on occasion, chartered a special plane, or arranged for transportation by ambulance, by air and by rail, and in one very serious case even arranged for a special train.

It has been said in Ontario, and we believe it to be true, that no one, irrespective of their social or financial standing could obtain better medical and surgical aid than is available to the injured workmen of Ontario, when such is shown to be necessary.

To insure necessary accommodation is available for serious and complicated cases, the Board leases 64 beds in the second floor of the Toronto General Hospital and 10 beds in the Solarium of the Toronto Western Hospital. The admitting and discharging of patients to these beds is under the control of the Board, and there is seldom an empty bed.

It is the Board's constant effort to place injured workmen in semi-private accommodation, not only because the facilities and comforts are greater than in the wards, but to insure the Doctor attending the case may continue to treat them, because in the public wards of most of our hospitals treatment must be given by staff doctors. In accordance with the Act, the Board does not pay to the Hospital any more than the man would be charged if himself paying the bill, the semi-private rates throughout the Province varies from $5.00 to $8.50, and probably averages $7.50.

Among the 24,000 pensioners of the Board, we have almost 80 Paraplegics, that is, workers who have suffered injury resulting in paralysis from the waist down and in some cases of the arms also. Since 1943, the Board has arranged for special expert treatment of these men and as a result of team work by three well known authorities of this particular condition, most of these Paraplegics have been taught to be independent regarding their personal care and personal needs, although their life is bounded by the scope of their wheel chair.

During the year 1950, almost two million dollars was paid for medical and surgical attention, and nearly two and a half million to hospitals, altogether almost five million dollars was paid out for necessary medical attention.

(PAGE B-8 FOLLOWS)

I bring that to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, to show that to a large extent the cost of these things which are being done are for things which are not tangible; they are not things you can see, like you can see the percentage paid to the insured workman, which, as you know, is 75%. But, it is a tremendous institution of itself, and is an added feature for the work of the workmens Compensation Board in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Justice Roach presented a Report, as he had been commissioned to enquire into and report to the Government on this very important piece of legislation, and I might say at the outset that I commend Mr. Justice Roach for a very fine Report. He was very thorough; he gave every organization, including manufacturing and representatives of the workers, every opportunity to present their briefs, and in my opinion it is a very worthwhile Report.

There is a t in it, Mr. Speaker, which might be considered as technical, and not possible to incorporate into an Act of Legislature all of Mr. Justice Roach's thinking, but I am sure that this very fine Report will be of great importance as a guide in the future administration of the Act, because I feel, Mr. Speaker, that in an Act such as we have here, dealing with injured people, the administration is really of as much importance as the actual legislation on the Statute, because it is a humane administration, which really accomplishes something for people who are in dire straits, because of their injury. That is where they really get the benefit, when there is humane and

conscientious administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in reviewing the sections of the Act, the hon. members will note that Section 1 deals with the so-called "waiting Period", that is to say, the time during which the workman receives no compensation, but only medical aid for his injury. This is contained in nearly all Workmen's Compensation Acts in Canada and in the United States, and in many a foreign country.

In Ontario it has always been a waiting period of seven days, but if the disability lasts that long, compensation is payable from the day of the accident. I would like the hon. members to note that if the disability lasts seven days, the man automatically receives full compensation from the time of his accident.

In some jurisdictions there is an absolute waiting period, no compensation being payable at all for the first three, five, or maybe seven days, as the case may be. In others, if a disability lasts long enough, say fourteen days, then compensation may be payable from the day of the accident. So you see, Mr. Speaker, in this jurisdiction, there is a different way of handling the waiting period. In Ontario, it has been seven days.

In Mr. Justice Roach's Report he recommended the number of days be reduced, and he added, "be reduced to four working days".

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the administration of this Act would be almost impossible, that is, the Act would be almost impossible to administer, especially until we get our new building, where we will have some space to administer it on four working days. That would entail the necessity of every insured person, no matter how minor

his injury, to report to the Workmens Compensation and be processed through the point of establishing whether the man actually lost four working days. So, in the opinion of the Government, it was decided that probably seven days was a little too long, but when you figure we have always included the day of the injury, even if the accident happened late in the afternoon, as one day, and the Saturday and Sunday which naturally followed, the waiting period was really very generous, when fixed at seven days.

However, we have decided to recommend to the Legislature that it be reduced to five days, as five days is considered to be a working week, and to eliminate from Mr. Justice Roach's recommendation, the word "working".

We feel we will have added cases under this of approximately 30,000 in a year. When you figure there are 180,000 cases reported to this Board in a year, you can understand what a difficult proposition it would be to have to process all these minor cases, and it is felt that the benefit to the workers would be out of all proportion to what it would cost to administer.

That is the first recommendation.

The second one is this; as you all know from 1943, the maximum amount on which a compensation would be paid was $2,500.00; in January, 1950, that was increased to $3,000.00, and we are now suggesting following Justice Roach's recommendation that it be increased to $4,000.00 as a maximum.

In other provinces in the Dominion it is still $2,500.00 and $3,000.00. It was felt, however, that when Mr. Justice

Meredith wrote this Act, that $2,000.00 at that time - and which remained for a goodly number of years - was the maximum that was considered to be the top rate of pay for workers. Now, I think it can be assumed that $4,000.00 is more in keeping with the times.

Section 4 is dealt with by Mr. Justice Roach on page 86.

"This is dealt with by Justice Roach

> "It simply means that an employer individually liable who is insured may pay in to the Board the full amount of his liability instead of having to wait until 75 per cent of the value of the periodical payments is exhausted, at which time his insurer may be out of business. Most of the employers desire this and the Board recommends it, as does Mr. Justice Roach."

(PAGE B-12 follows)

Section 5: an Ontario workman may be killed in British Columbia or Nova Scotia and the cost of transporting the body home is heavy, and this provided additional funds.

You will recall that in the Report by Mr. Justice Roach he recommended that the expenses allowed for the burial of a workman was $125.00. The Judge recommended that it be increased to $200.00. In thinking this over I felt that was not quite enough. The procedure today is if a man is killed, the Workmens Compensation Board immediately upon notification of the death sends $100.00 cash to the widow or other dependent eligible to receive this money. This goes out the very same day, if possible. In addition, $125.00 was allowed for burial. But that $125.00 did not go to the dependent person; it went direct to the undertaker who might perform the burial services. So I felt if we were to increase, as the Judge recommended, the commitment for burial to $200.00, that $200.00 would, as I say, go directly to the Funeral director. But I felt we should also give the woman, or whoever it might be, an additional $100.00, so that instead of $100.00 going out on the day of death, we would make it $200.00, because we felt that in times such as those, more expenses are incurred. There are always additional things which have to be secured around the home where a death has occurred, and this would give the person an extra $100.00 with which to purchase, if she so desires, a little better funeral than a $200.00 funeral. It would put her in a bargaining position to supply the type and kind of funeral which she would like to have. I think that, if anything, is considerably more generous than Mr. Justice Roach recommended, and I believe it will accomplish more.

Another recommendation we are making in this Act is where a man is killed away from home, at the present time the Board is empowered to pay up to $175.00 to bring the body home. We have found many cases where $175.00 is not sufficient, such as the cases I have mentioned, where a man might be killed, say, up in the Red Lake District where the body may have to be flown out. The widow receiving $175.00 will find it helps, but it might be necessary for her to contribute a considerable amount in addition before finally getting the body home, so I am asking the hon. members to remove any sum by this Act, so that the Board may be empowered, where a death occurs away from home, to bring the body home. It might cost $125.00; it might cost $500.00, but they would be empowered to bring the body back home.

(TAKE "C" FOLLOWS)

Section 6 is a technical amendment to provide for a change in the Drugless Practitioners Act, which is separately covered under the Chropodists Act. This removes any doubt as to the Board's authority for determining questions as to the payment of medical aid. In other words, it will be able to pay medical aid to chiropodists or whoever is involved.

In Section 3 of Section 6, the question has arisen in a case before the Board as to the right of a doctor to sue a workman for his fees and, inasmuch as the Board is obligated to provide the workman with medical aid free of charge, then by implication the workman in his turn might have a legal right to sue the Board. It is considered advisable that fees and charges for medical aid should be paid by the Board out of the cost of the fund, and that no right of action should lie against the workman or his employer or any person supplying medical aid to an injured workman on the job.

The Board is given power to determine the amount of medical fees, and no action shall lie against it for any greater amount than fixed by it. As a matter of fact, the Board's schedule of fees has been fixed after conference with The Ontario Medical Association, representing the profession. The work involved in checking and fixing the amount of fees and charges for medical aid is very large, and is rendered difficult unless the accounts are filed with reasonable promptness. This has been a very difficult proposition with the Board. In practise many of the doctors will withhold accounts as long as six years, perhaps, with

the object of obtaining payment at the most propitious time for calculating Dominion Income Tax.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Hear, hear.

MR. DALEY: But this problem has been taken up with the representatives of the Ontario Medical Association, who agree that a penalty by way of a percentage reduction in the amount would likely remedy the trouble. The Board is to be given discretion as to the penalty.

Section 9 is to enable the Board to prepare for the changes, the increases to come into force on the 1st of January, 1952. More office space may be necessary to take care of the increased number of claims and claimants arising from the reduction in the waiting period from 7 to 5 days and arrangements on sums are difficult to adjust in the middle of the year, having regard to the increase from $3,000.00 to $4,000.00 on the basis of compensation, because these assessments have already gone out for this year, and the basis of compensation will also be made effective as of January 1952.

MR. F. K. FELL (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House, and certainly in this group, are very grateful to see at least some improving amendments, being offered by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) in regard to The Workmen's Compensation Act. We came to the conclusion to-day that all is not wasted here to-day. We have been pleading, plotting, recommending, suggesting for some time similar changes as are now coming forth from the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) and we are now convinced that perhaps we may get more if we keep on.

We are very seriously concerned, however, with the

fact that during last year we did have in this Province a Commission acting under the directorship of the hon. Mr. W. D. Roach and that under that Commission or through that Commission expressions of opinion of all representative groups throughout the Province had an opportunity of finding a hearing before this Board. I hold in my hand now the report of the Commission and though I do not intend to dwell at length on the various representations that were made through that Board--to that Commission at the time, one who would look at the attendance record of those who did appear before this Commission would most certainly be impressed with the source of information which went into the making up of this Commission Report. We in this group are satisfied that was an excellent [illegible] Commission. We in this group are satisfied that practically all the recommendations of the Hope--or, at least, pardon me, I want that corrected there; change that "Hope" to "Roach" down there.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Oh, that is just the gramaphone record that you are on.

MR. FELL: No gramaphone record here. Practially all of the recommendations of this Hope---

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FELL: This Roach Commission.

MR. PORTER: Careful.

MR. FELL: See what you have done to us?--could be accepted. In point of fact, the Commission Report recommends 16 very important changes. Everyone of those changes might have been accepted by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) without any difficulty at all, and yet we find that there are

only actually 3 or 4 being accepted and incorporated in this amending Bill which is now before this Legislature.

We would suggest to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) that a report as good as this should find more consideration from this Legislative Assembly than it is being accorded now, merely by taking out three of the recommendations, inserting them in an amending Bill and tossing the balance of the report aside. We certainly feel that this, if at no other time, is an ideal time for the Standing Committee on Labour in this Legislative Assembly to meet---

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FELL: ---and to take this Workmen's Compensation Recommendation Report by Mr. Justice Roach under consideration and to bring back to this Legislative Assembly recommendations such as are contained in the remaining 13 recommendations in this report.

MR. SALSBERG: Hear, hear.

MR. FELL: I am perhaps more impressed, as are most of those who have considered the Roach Report and the Bill now before this House,-- not so much with what is in this Bill as with what is not in the Bill.

I do not intend on second reading to dwell on many of the things that are missed from this Bill, but I should like to point out one which I think is quite important and certainly deserves the consideration of the entire Assembly. For instance, there is no recommendation for relief for those accident cases which happened at a time when compensation was calculated at either 55 per cent. or 66 2/3 per cent. They still remain at that level. Now, it is all well and good

to say: "Well, that is going to take a lot of money to straighten out, we can deal with that question because I do not think it will take as much as some would think; the important point is that we have people in this Province who were seriously injured at a time when their weekly earnings were Ten and Fifteen Dollars a week, and the compensation has been calculated on that Ten and Fifteen Dollars a week, at 55 per cent. I do not think it takes a great deal of mathematical education to see that those people are to-day attempting to exist under the most impossible conditions. They just cannot live on Two or Three Dollars a week, which might very well be the case.

MR. DALEY: Of course that could work in reverse, too.

MR. FELL: I do not see the point.

MR. SALSBERG: Not if you do not let it work in reverse.

MR. DALEY: I mean if a man was hurt to-day, when wages are high, and in a few years they drop down, we would be paying him then on the high scale.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): That does not help the other fellow.

MR. FELL: If I had some assurance from responsible sources that if the cost of living does increase it will be turned back to the persons injured at the time wages were Ten or Fifteen Dollars per week, I would be prepared to sit down.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): You should have read your Leader's speeches five or six years ago.

MR. FELL: I was too young then, I think.

MR. FROST: You should get them. There is some good, fatherly advice there.

MR. FELL: It is a serious problem, and a problem which every hon. Member of this Assembly wants at some time or another to come into personal contact with. I think we get letters from all over the Province saying: "What can you possibly do to help me? I was injured back in the twenties", or "I was injured back in the thirties, I am now expected to continue living on 55 per cent. of $10.00 or $15.00 a week, and it just is not enough and I am now incapable of working again."

I think the very least that could have been done at this time, the very least the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) might have done would have been to insert in this amending Bill a provision which would increase it to at least 75 per cent. of that early wage. It still would not have been enough, it would have been at least some encouragement for these people and might have a more reasonable focuse with what we are attempting to do in other fields.

I do not want to dwell too long in second reading on this, because I think we will have ample opportunity in committee stage, to discuss many of the ramifications and aspects of the Bill as related to the Compensation Commission Report, but I would certainly seriously and emphatically suggest to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) at this time that the Labour Committee of this Legislative Assembly be called at an early date to do two things-- I was prepared to recommend they do one, I am now prepared to recommend they do two--the first I would

suggest is that the Committee be called together to consider this Report for the purpose of recommending further improvements to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) and to this Legislative Assembly; and, secondly, to take the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) up on his invitation to attend and to visit Malton. I think if we called the Committee together we would pretty nearly have the 30 visitors that the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) has very kindly invited to attend.

In closing my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I should like to move an amendment to the motion for second reading:

> "Moved by myself, seconded by Mr. Park, that the motion be amended by adding thereto the following words:
>
> > 'and that the said Bill be referred forthwith to the Standing Committee on Labour and that the said Committee be authorized to incorporate in the Bill provisions implementing the recommendations of the Hon. Mr. Justice Roach regarding accident prevention, industrial diseases, compensation for second injuries and injuries aggravated by pre-existing physical conditions, and such other recommendations of the said Mr. Justice Roach as the Committee deems advisable ' " .

MR. SALSBERG: The Bill before us will undoubtedly be looked upon as one of the major pieces of legislation

that we will have the opportunity of dealing with during this Session, not because of the importance of the amendments contained in the Bill, --- though I admit that they are each and every one of them important and welcome --- but rather because of the failure of the Government to bring in amendments that are so sorely needed and that are astonishingly omitted from this Bill.

The Hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) in whose name this Bill stands, has told us about the importance and value of the Rehabilitation Centre in Malton, and I think every hon. Member of the House will agree with him that the centre is an important and valuable part of the compensation work carried on by The Workmen's Compensation Board. It is customary also for the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) and for other hon. Members of the Government to speak of The Workmen's Compensation Act of this Province as being among the most advanced Acts of that sort to be found elsewhere in Canada or in the United States. To-day the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) has gone further afield and spoke of it as being the best in the universe. I think those were the words he used, and of course, having said that, he leaves no room for question. The universe covers quite a territory.

MR. DALEY: It takes it all in.

MR. SALSBERG: Now, I, like all other hon. members, recognize that our compensation law is an advance on similar laws existing in other provinces and in other parts of the world, and we are quite proud of it. We know that this was brought about in the course of years by the efforts of

the organized workers, in the first place, the pressure they exercised on all governments for many years, and because of the general support that the presentations, the demands of organized labour received from all forward-looking sections of the population. But I suggest it is not enough at a time like this, after a Royal Commission investigation, to rest on the laurels of the past and be so hesitant and conservative--with a small "c"--in applying, or rather in implementing the recommendations made by the Royal Commission. Certainly our Act is better than that of many other Provinces, but we do want to pioneer this legislation and we want to set an example, and furthermore we can afford to do that and there is no question about the need for improving it. But that is not enough.

The Commission Report is welcomed as a step forward by organized labour and by all socially conscious people. It is recognized as an advance in the field of it's type of legislation, and assistance of people who suffer because of circumstances beyond their control, while at work. But the Report does not satisfy labour, nor other organized groups, completely. Let there be no mistake about that. Organized labour does not consider the Report as the last word in the improvement of compensation legislation and services. There will be a continuation, I am certain, of efforts to bring in legislation, or ask for legislation, that is not even contained in the fine Report of Mr. Justice Roach, but certainly we have a right to expect that the minimum of improvements recommended by Mr. Justice Roach should be incorporated in legislation and be made

applicable without delay. That is the least we can expect, and it is therefore shocking to find the number of omissions in this Legislations.

The Legislation recommends in the main three items with which there is full agreement, no quarrel--may I correct myself? I would quarrel with even one of those recommendations. I think the recommendation for the reduction of the waiting period should be as recommended by the Commission and not as compromised by the Government. The recommendation was to reduce it from 7 to 4.

MR. FROST: No, no, "working days."

MR. DALEY: Working days.

MR. FROST: Work days.

MR. SALSBERG: That is right. I know.

MR. FROST: That makes a big difference.

MR. DALEY: Well, this is much better.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not know whether it is much better.

MR. FROST: Yes, this is much better.

MR. SALSBERG: However, I would ask for it. Then, leaving out the very positive recommendations taken from the Report, the shocking thing is what is omitted, and I believe that this Bill will receive many, many amendments if and when it comes to the committee stage. I am sure that hon. Members of this House will seek to amend it. I, for one, will undoubtedly seek to do so in a number of instances, and this is one type of legislation where a private Member can move an amendment that calls for the expenditure of money, because it is not expenditure of the

public exchequer.

MR. FROST: Well, I disagree with that entirely, Mr. Speaker. I think this motion is out of order, but I will come to that later.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, this is merely an advice to the Government of intention to do something. I am not out of order yet. When I move amendments, we will it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: But I want to touch on a few of the omissions, which are very serious. For instance there is a recommendation contained in the Report covering injuries aggravated by pre-existing physical conditions, in which the commissioner provides the wording for an amendment to the existing Act. Now, Mr. Speaker, this may sound like one of secondary importance, but for anyone who has personal dealings with injured workers when their cases are before the Compensation Board, to anyone in such a position this is a terribly important item, and a recommendation which we should adopt at once.

What does it mean? Mr. Speaker, I can illustrate by citing from two current cases that I am handling with the Compensation Board. One is that of a worker who was employed for 21 years by a very large corporation--I will mention the name: The Aluminum Company of Canada--he received compensation for the period of his injury, he is discharged, he continues to complain, however, of an inability to work and of conditions in his body that make it impossible for him to continue in the work he was engaged in prior to the

accident. The Compensation Board says that they are through, that whatever illness may still exist is due to either causes. Now this man has had two previous injuries while at work, one of which was a compensation case, the other was not even referred to compensation, he was sent back to work after a short period. Now, for all intents and purposes, that man is incapable of working, and there is no doubt that his condition is aggravated, undoubtedly, by previous injuries that he has received, and certainly people in that category should be able to receive the compensation that they are entitled to. They are not malingerers, they are victims of industrial accidents, and certainly that recommendation contained on page 46 should definitely be incorporated in the amendments coming here.

I have another case which is current, the head of a family, father of three children, who is considered to be discharged by The Workmen's Compensation Board. The man is physically unable to go to work, and yet The Board claims that his difficulties are not due to the accident but may be due to some previous experience. And the family is broken up. He has to live on City relief, and I suggest that certainly such an amendment should not be denied by the Government.

(TAKE "D" FOLLOWS")

Just one omission, Mr. Speaker, which is really an outstanding one, is the failure of the government to include in this Bill the recommendation made by the Hon. Mr. Justice Roach which would empower the Board, the Workmen's Compensation Board, to pass regulations adding to the Schedule No. 3 any disease not previously named therein and which is peculiar to or characteristic of a particular industrial process, trade or occupation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that recommendation of the Commission is also extremely important, even though it may affect a number of injured workmen, but to the group affected, this is actually a matter of life and death and certainly there is no justification for the failure of the government to recommend incorporation of legislation as suggested by the Commission. What it simply means is that, if, in the opinion of the Board, a certain occupational illness should be classified as an industrial disease and enables workers so affected to receive compensation, they should have the authority to do so. Well, that is the minimum that one could expect and I cannot for the world understand why that recommendation contained on page 53 should have been omitted. Certainly you can trust the Board to come to proper conclusions. The hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) is aware of cases that are brought to him, as they are brought to other members of the government, and certainly brought to members of the Legislature by their constituents, where more than one worker begins to suffer from an illness which in their opinion is traceable

to their occupation or engagement. Certainly that should have been encouraged.

May I add that these are not recommendations that would call for radical increases in the rates paid by the employers, although I would say that if they called for great increases, they should have been included; but, it would not radically increase the payments made by employers. One may argue they might affect many workers. Precisely, they would not. Certainly we should take care of the minority who suffer.

Another item which amazes me is the recommendation contained on page 55 of the Report of the Commission. The Commissioner says, and I quote from page 55: "I therefore recommend that lung cancer be added to Schedule 3 and be compensable where the workman is employed in a process in which he is subjected to the inhalation of gasses from coal, tar and pitch."

Hon. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labor): Might I interject, with your permission, Mr. Speaker? We who administer the Act feel that our present section dealing with the industrial diseases amply takes care of that. There is no amendment required at all. We are dealing with those cases right now under the authority which we have.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Now, Mr. Speaker, the arguments for and against the inclusion of such a clause were presented to the Commission very adequately. I was there when that was argued and the Commissioner

came to the conclusion that there should be a specific clause. He was, evidently, not convinced that the Board is including such categories of workers. This arose particularly in the case of the employees of the Consumers Gas Company where cancer of the lungs has affected an alarmingly large number of workers employed in a certain department of that company. Now I say that if the Hon. Mr. Justice Roach, who had before him all the arguments, and all of the points of view on a question like this, concluded that it should be specified in the Act and actually worded the amendment for us, certainly that should have been included.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to continue. There are many more items of a similar character. I wanted to illustrate to the House the character of the omissions of the government, and I want to conclude now with two appeals directed to the government. First, that even at this late hour they reconsider this Bill and realize the necessity of incorporating the changes recommended by the Commission. I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), if he could find time to go into this matter and acquaint himself with the recommendations, will agree that the Bill should be broadened and that at least those recommendations made by the Commission should be incorporated in the Bill; and, second, Mr. Speaker, that the government agree to the proposal made here by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Fell), that this Bill go to the Standing Committee. I agree fully with what he

said and with the amendment which is before the House. I think the government should agree. Certainly this Bill should be studied carefully by the SpecialCommittee set up by this House expressly for such purposes.

I hope the government will agree to both these suggestions.

MR.EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to prolong the debate on this Bill undly, but I say there are one or two points which have yet to be made in this debate. I, however, would appeal to the government to agree to this reference to the Labor Committee.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PARK: I think that a great deal of good would come out of a meeting outside of the slightly party atmosphere which is bound to exist in this Chamber, if we could get around and discuss the recommendations of the Hon. Mr. Justice Roach in the informal atmosphere which exists at a meeting at a Committee of the House. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will know that a few days ago he received a communication from the Ontario Federation of Labor which expressed regret that the Bill before this House does not go as far as the recommendations of the Hon. Mr. Justice Roach, and the Federation requested, I believe, that the Prime Minister should hold up the Bill in the House until they had an opportunity to discuss the matter, with him. Now, there will beother groups which will want to make recommendations also, and certainly there will be opportunity to hear them if we were to bring this

Bill before the Labor Committee. The work which the Hon. Mr. Justice Roach has done on the Workmen's Compensation Act is very important. I think it is the most complete study which has made of on the Act almost since its inception

It has been the most complete inquiry into the functions of the Act; and recommendation after recommendation which he makes are vitally important to the Workmen's Compensation Act, and should be given serious consideration. The government is very proud of the Workmen's Compensation Act, and has every reason to be proud of it. This province is very proud of the Workmen's Compensation Act. We have every reason to believe that this province was the leader in workmen's compensation. I think we can, without the necessity of party differences, and so forth, get to work in the Labor Committee and bring forward a great many improvements over and above those which are included in this Bill. The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Fell) made reference to the fact that there were some sixteen or seventeen recommendations made by the hon. Mr. Justice Roach, and each and every one of them is worthy of serious consideration by the members of the House.

I want to say here that I had an opportunity to go to Malton. The hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley), mentioned Malton. I had an opportunity to observe the conditions which exist there. The Workmen's Compensation Board, and the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) have every reason to be proud of that Rehabilitation Centre. I have been impressed, too, with the view taken by members of the Workmen's Compensation

Board. Mr. Sparrow, the Chairman of the Board, for example, has time and again made the point clear that in the view of the Board one of the most important things that had to be done was the development of accident prevention, that the prevention of accidents was of more importance, in fact, than compensation for accidents. The more accidents we can prevent the better. And, of course, the development of the Rehabilitation Centre is such that it clearly says that the Commission is aware of the need for repairing injured workmen to get them back on the job as quickly as possible; and that is why I was most surprised that the government has not acted on the recommendations of the Hon. Mr. Justice Roach with regard to accident prevention. That Section of the report is, I think, one of the strongest sections in the Hon. Mr. Justice Roach's findings, and certainly it ought to have received greater attention from the government.

In 1949, in the Province of Ontario, according to the Report of the Board, we had 179,000 industrial accidents in this province. That is a pretty substantial total, and anything which can be done to reduce the number of accidents should be done. The question of accident prevention is a vitally important one and is, as I say, one to which the hon. Mr. Justice Roach makes reference in his report and upon which he lays great stress. We have 179,000 accidents last year in the Province of Ontario and anything we can do to cut down those numbers of accidents should be done, and certainly we cannot afford

to ignore the recommendations made by a Royal Commission which investigated this subject in the course of its enquiries into the Workmen's Compensation Act.

In the Province of Ontario safety and accident prevention is in the hands of a number of associations to which the Workmen's Compensation Board turns over money. I am just going to put on the record the money paid in 1949 to these accident prevention organizations. The Lumbermen's Safety Association received $57,000. I am putting it in round figures. The Ontario Pulp and Paper Makers Safety Association received $18,000; the Mines Accident Prevention Association of Ontario received $34,000; Class 20 Accident Prevention Association received $47,000; the Electrical Employers Association of Ontario received $908; the Construction Safety Association of Ontario received $50,000; the Ontario Highway Construction Safety Association received $16,000; and the Industrial Accident Prevention Association received $218,000 from the Workmen's Compensation Board.

There is close to $400,000 paid out by the Workmen's Compensation Board in the year 1949 to the various Accident Prevention associations, yet the Workmen's Compensation Board has not one single, solitary word to say, to these Accident Prevention associations, as to how they conduct their business. As a matter of fact, one of the startling things which was reported by the Hon. Mr. Justice Roach was that no inspectors were employed by

threeof the associations---the Mines Accident Prevention Association of Ontario, the Ontario Pulp and Paper Makers Safety Association, and, the Electrical Employers Association of Ontario. No inspectors were employed by these three Associations, at all, to do any inspecting in respect of safety, yet each association received money from the Workmen's Compensation Board. I suggest when the Hon. Mr. Justice Roach examined this matter he was quite strongly of the opinion that the Accident Prevention Department of our Workmen's Compensation Act was one of the weakest features of this Act, and one which had to be improved.

(Take E follows)

Let me just quote from Mr. Justice Roach's Report:

"In my respectful opinion, the present provisions of the Act dealing with accident prevention are not adequate and need revision."

Certainly that is not what I would have expected but that it would have been one section of the recommendation of Mr. Justice Roach that the Government would quinckly and hyrriedly enacted upon. Let me quote a little more from Mr. Justice Roach:

"Since accident prevention is of common interest to both employers and workmen it would seem logical that they should both actively participate in any organized system the purpose of which is to lessen industrial accidents. As between the two groups, it seems to me that the workmen are much more vitally interested than the employers, If a workman is maimed in an industry, the employer has to pay the compensation but no monetary allowance can ever adequately compensate a workman who has go go through the balance of his life minus an eye, or a hand or some other member. "

And yet, the fact of the matter is, that on these Accident Prevention Associations,there is no representation of labour at all, there are only representatives of employers. From time to time they send pretty little leaflets telling the workers not to drop a ton of steel on their toes but nothing to tell an employer to put up a safety guard to prevent someone having a hand cut off. That is the way they work.

SOME hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

MR. DALEY: A most unfair statement to make.

MR. PARK: I appeal to the Government, to the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) that they accept the recommendation of Mr.Justice Roach on this vitally important question of accident prevention. TheWorkmen's Compensation Board which s supplies all that money for these employers groups have not even the right under the Act right now to enquire as to if the Association has inspectors or how many inspectors they have to such degree of inspection they are making. The Board has no authority whatsoever in that regard.

MR. DALEY: They submit a detailed account.

MR. PARK: Mr. Justice Roach does not agree with the hon. Minister (Mr.Daley) in that statement and I think if he made enquiries of his Commissioners he would find as a matter of fact that the Commissioners do not agree in that respect and if I know of any Section of this Report that the members of the Canadian Manufacturers Association would like to see, it is this accident prevention. They have been very conscious--

MR. DALEY: You do not know what you are talking about.

MR. PARK: They have been very conscious of the weakness of the Act in that respect so I ask the Government please, to agree to reconsider the provision of the Act dealing with accident prevention and the recommendations certainly should be brought before the Labour Committee so they could be properly dealt with. There are other important recommendations which are not covered by the amendments before us. I would have expected that the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) might have given us an intimation of

the recommendations of the Board respecting second injuries would be altered in line with the recommendations of Mr. Justice Roach. It is not necessary according to Mr. Justice Roach that there should be an alteration on that point but by regulations of the Board it could be altered. It wouldbe well if the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley). could see to it that the recommendations could be altered to take care of that.

Let me explain to the hon. members of the House who may not be so familiar with that section of the Act, how it operates. A man is injured in 1942 and he recovers from the injury and report to his job. Then, he subsequently suffers a re-occurrence of that injury, say, in 1950. Under the regulations of the Board as it now exists, it is counted as an injury which occurred in 1942 and he is paid at the 1942 rate of 66 2/3 of the lower wage he was receiving at that time rather than the wa e he was receiving in 1950.

Mr. Justice Roach is quite specific on that and certainly there is nothing in that recommendation which the Government ought to be afraid to proceed with.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken much longer that I intended, but I am worried about the Government's failure to act on accident prevention and second injuries. I received a letter as I suppose a number of the hon. members of this Legislature have, on behalf [illegible] of a group of the Canadian Wine Institute in the constituency of St. Catharines which is the constituency of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) and that letter made very clear the position of the manufacturers to any improvement

in accident prevention. Let me quote the concluding paragraph:

> "We have been informed that the Canadian Manufacturers Association will be making representations to the Government of Ontario aginast the recommendations contained in the Commissioners Report in this respect."

Accident prevention is what we are speaking of.

> "We have therefore been asked to put the Members of the Canadian Wine Institute on record as supporting the view of the Canadian Manufacturers Association in respect to such changes in the existing legislation."

It is quite obvious to me that these reports have been made and quite obvious, too, that the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) prefers to listen to the advice of the Canadian Manufacturers Association on accident prevention rather than the advice of Mr. Justice Roach whose advice, I may say, is supported by all the labour movements in this country no matter what its affiliation. I hope that the Government will give serious consideration to the proposal that further improvements other than those that are indicated by the amendments that have been moved by the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley), that further improvement may be overcome and as I said as I started out, I can think of nothing better than this, it is important that these improvements

be introduced without the existence of a party atmosphere, without the necessity of political differences having an effect on our thinking. I can think of no better place for it to be introduced than through the Labour Committee of the House and I would ask the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) to give serious consideration to this Bill, along with other recommendations of Mr. Justice Roach should be taken up by the Labour Committee of this House.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the hon. Minister (Mr.Daley replies, I do not think it should be closed quite yet. I wanted to make some comments on this matter from a slightly different angle. I am not going to retrace ground that has already been covered by other speaker., I was going to suggest that there need be no partisan differences on at least one aspect of this matter. I do not think I am telling the Government anything that is not known when I say that the Royal Commissioner who enquired into this whole question was a man of exceptional qualifications. Mr. Justice Roach is a very able Judge who served for a good many years as High Court Judge and was then promoted to the Court of Appeal. Not only that, but there are few Judges who have had more experiences in labour matters or industrial relation matters than Mr. Justice Roach. Now, I know there have been from time to time and from various quarters some criticisms on the practice of using Judges such as are used in labour cases and there has

been criticism also for using them so much as Royal Commissioners. What I want to emphasize to the Government is that in this case a Judge of very high standing was appointed as Royal Commissioner, he was one who had a very considerable experience in matters of this kind and I am sure the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) will agree that he did the work under his Commission in a most exceptional and thorough manner.

And now, I believe, criticism may have been offered in time past of some Judges for the work they have done and I might say I have suffered from some of their decisions just like everybody else. I do not think anyone can raise that question in this case. You could not have got anyone who was mor competent or more thorough at his job than Mr.Justice Roach and, therefore, I suggest to the Government and to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr.Daley) that the very greatest weight should be attached to his recommendations and to the emphasis which he gives on such matters as accident prevention. I say, Mr. Speaker, to the Government with the greatest respect, that none of you are in a position or have the time to make an enquiry anywhere near as thorough as the one that was made by Mr. Justice Roach and he approaches the issues I think in a judicial spirit. I am at a loss to understand it. Here again I say there may be no partisan differences in a matter of this kind because here you have a job done by the best man you could find to do it and he makes a finding of the most categorical nature, and, as the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) pointed out,

says, "in my respectful opinion the present provisions of the Act dealing with accident prevention are not adequate and need revision."

Surely the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) is not attempting to tell us that we are rejecting that advice, the best advice you can possibly get on a matter from the best equipped man you could find? This was not quoted by the hon. Member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) but I think I should quote a little from what he says about the matter because he is very definite about it. On page 22 of the Report:

> "My first criticism of the present system is that it does not provide any means which will ensure the active participation of labour in the work of accident prevention.
>
> "My second criticism is that the relationship between the Board and the associations is much too remote. The Board, it is true, scrutinizes the annual budget of such associations; the managers of the associations, some of them much more frequently than others, confer with the Board verbally, and on occasions in writing complain about what those managers consider are flagrant violations of safety regulations; but ehre are too few occasions in which the Board gets its hand on the pulse of the associations to determine the extent to which they are carrying out the work of accident prevention. In saying that, I do not mean to criticize the Board, but I do

mean to criticize the system. There is no statutory obligation on any of those associations to report to anyone. Each association was brought into existence on the application of a representative group of employers in one or more classes. They owe no duty to anyone. There is no statutory obligations on them to continue to function and the extent to which they function is their own business. Although it is not likely to happen it is pertinent to observe that if any one of them ceased to function to-morrow there are no provisions in the Act for the carrying on of the important work of accident prevention.

"Since those associations are now in existence and functioning I do not recommend their abolition, but in my respectful opinion there should be a much closer relationship between them and the Board than presently exists.

"Even if those associations should be functioning at the highest degree of efficiency and under direct supervision of the Board there would still be something lacking in the system. In my respectful opinion any completely organized system of accident prevention requires as part thereof committees of employers and workmen at plant level. Specific duties should be laid down for those committees and they should be

required to report periodically to the Board. If the Board is in receipt of such reports, it will be in a position to gauge the effectiveness of the work of the associations. The Board under the British Columbia Act has passed a regulation requiring the setting up of such committees and informed me that it has found them very effective in the work of accident prevention."

Now, Mr. Speaker, when you get findings as clear as those findings, from an authority like Mr. Justice Roach, I just cannot understand the hon. Minister's (Mr. Daley) attitude that there is no substance in what the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) has been saying. I do not understand it and I am sure he would be prepared to give it a second thought.

MR. DALEY: Who expressed my attitude as being that there was no substance in what he said?

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) made it very clear.

MR. FROST: The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) is picking a quarrel. There is nothing to quarrel about.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, as I said to twice, there is no need for political differences about this matter at all so when the hon. Member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) says that this a disastrous and glaring omission from the Bill, that is, the matter of accident prevention, the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) shakes his head

and attempts to deny what the Commissioner has said about the lack ofliaison between the appropriations and the Board. And now, unless there is some serious misunderstanding here, the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) is --

MR. DALEY: I would like to be able to explain my attitude, not have you surmize.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am surmizing nothing, the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) did not remain silent while the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) was speaking. Now, let us not try to --

MR. HOST: The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) should not become political.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am not going to stand here and be told by the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) that he did not express an opinion, he most certainly did and tried to contradict a fact that was quoted from the report of Mr. Justice Roach. If there is an explanation we will be glad to hear it from the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley). This could be more effectively discussed in the Labour Committee than here. It seems to be that I am muddying the waters here but, as a matter of fact,it was not my intention to speak until I learned from what the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) said that he did not accept our interpretation or our quotations of Mr. Justice Roach on accident prevention.

MR. DALEY: Any quotations that were made were made Mr. Justice Roach's Report, how can I say they were not correct when he was reading them right out of the Report? I made no such comment and I will admit to

this House right now, I think industrial accident prevention is a tremendous subject.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Will you admit it is unsatisfactory?

MR. DALEY: I would not go as far as that, but I know a different form has been attempted in other provinces and from the advice we have been able to get, it has not worked out as satisfactorily as our own system.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You did not get that opinion from Mr. Justice Roach?

MR. DALEY: And now, in accident prevention I think it is fair to say in spite of what some people think and the attitude they take when they talk about an employer that he is a very low type of creature in this economy of ours. I do not think that; I find our employers in this Province are mighty fine people, in general.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St.Andrew): What has that to do with the question?

MR. DALEY: You keep your face shut.

MR. SALSBERG: None whatever, the Royal Commissioner listened to the arguments for days on this case.

HON. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): You talk for half an hour and say nothing.

MR. SALSBERG: Get a new pair of glasses and read it to-morrow and you will learn something.

MR. DALEY: I am telling you the employers in this Province in general, as such, are as much interested in industrial accident prevention as the workers are; under the Act they have the right to establish in certain

groups certain practices of industrial prevention. I would not go sa far as to say,-- and I have told the Canadian Manufacturers Association and this Winery that you speak of, because I have that letter,-- the very same thing, that I at this time am absolutely satisfied that all is being done that can be done under in regard to accident prevention.

Here you have a great body of industrial people endeavoring to do a job. To intimate that they are just throwing the money away and there is no check on what they are spending, is just a lot of nonsense.

Mr. SALSBERG: Mr. Justice Roach said that.

MR. DALEY: They are scrutinized very carefully and many suggestions are made which they comply with.

(TAKE "F" FOLLOWS)

sometimes to spend more money than they are spending; at other times to cut down a little. No one has ever complained. It is the manufacturers, you must understand, Mr. Speaker, who put all the money up which in turn goes back to them for accident prevention. It comes out of money for--

MR. PARK: It is the workers who put up the arms and legs which are lost.

MR. DALEY: Yes, and we have all the sympathy in the world for them. If you can show me anything further which can be done, I will be the first one to approve of it. I do not think anyone can say that since my term in office I have not put every emphasis I can to improve the position of the workers.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Will the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) permit a question? Will the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) tell us whether he agrees or disagrees with the quotations I read from the Roach Report?

MR. DALEY: I do not think that is a fair question.

MR. SALSBERG: It is a simple question, "Yes" or "No".

MR. FROST: We are a very progressive government over here.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Are you going to dodge that question?

MR. DALEY: In the present Act, the employers are spending a great deal of time and effort---and money, too, because it is their money---and are as anxious to improve this as anyone else. I have certain ideas, and have had for three or four years, that something could be done, but

the only handicap we have had---and goodness knows we have tried to get new quarters for the administration of this Compensation Act for the last four or five years, and it is only starting to come to a head now---when we get larger quarters, I believe that all the sections of the Accident Prevention could be brought under one roof, and there would be close cooperation between the Board and the Accident Prevention groups.

I suggest to the employers today to utilize to the fullest extent the knowledgeand wisdom of the workers in the plants, in an attempt to eliminate accidents. They do, at the present time, use the foremen and the shop stewards, and they have a very close contact with the workers--

MR. JOLLIFFE: Some do and some do not, You must know that.

MR. DALEY: That may be--

MR. PARK: They do not have enough inspectors.

MR. DALEY: You would think they are not interested, from what has been said here, but I think the employers are interested, and I think over a period of years they have done an excellent job in connection with accident prevention in this country, and I am not one who will wreck a system which is working because one individual---as much as I admire the Judge's report---suggests some things which might be theoretically sound,

but not practical in the actual administration of the Act.

MR. JOLLIFFE: In other words, you do not agree?

MR. DALEY: I can assure this House that accident prevention, because of Mr. Justice Roach's report, will receive all the consideration that I and the Board or anybody else can give it, but it isnot possible to say we are going to tear this thing out by the roots, which has done such a good job, and say to all the employers of labor in this province, "You have failed," because they have not failed.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Did the Commissioner suggest anything of the sort? The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) is putting words into the mouth of the Commissioner which were never there. So it must be a weak case.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has not read the brief on that point.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in connection with this Bill, may I say that my hon. friends opposite raised the point, and impressed it, that there should be an impartial consideration, and they have imputed all manner of bad faith and evasion.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh no, there is no evasion.

MR. FROST: I say that to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), that this Bill is really a substantial compliance with Mr. Justice Roach's report.

Mr. Justice Roach's report is a very excellent document.

May I say, first of all, that what we are doing here is not the last word by any means. I know the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) will agree. There are pointsinvolved in this matter which are in some cases difficult. The hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) mentioned the fact that representations were being made to us and would be made to us. We expect to hear a very important representation on the 21st of this month; it is not our idea to push this matter through to Committee stage; we intend to allow it to be carried along, and we will be very glad to listen to those representations. These people are good people, and we will certainly listen to them.

We were very much interested in listening to the representations from a number of labor organizations, including the railroad men and others. We intend to keep our minds open in connection with this matter, and we do not intend, as the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) says, to "rock the boat," and do some things which might be unsound in the long pull.

I know that the hon. members opposite will agree with what I have said about other Commissions. The government, nor this Legislature, are not bound by the reports of any Commission. It is for the 90 hon. members here to take these things and consider them, and take appropriate action from time to time.

There may be things in Mr. Justice Roach's report which should not be carried out, perhaps, for

a very considerable period of time. That does not detract from the fact that the recommendations are good.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these things occurred to me at once. First, the waiting period is reduced. I will say to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that the five day basis is far better for labor than the four working days.

I will say to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that he will learn something from this debate, because he opposed the five-day basis. It reduces the technicalities, and makes it easier to administer, and is infinitely more favorable to the working man. If you consider the last Christmas week, it was a very long one, Saturday, Sunday, Monday and Boxing Day, four days before his four days would start to count. Under the recommendation contained in the report the waiting period would not end, as I understand, until four days after Boxing Day, which would mean eight days. Under the present arrangement, if this Bill passes, it would come into effect the following Thursday, or five days. That is a better recommendation.

The hon. members opposite argue, "Because the Judge says so-and-so, you do it." I imagine that every one of the twenty-one hon. members in opposition would vote against that recommendation, and in favor of what we are doing.

There are other things. We have increased the

maximum to $4,000. That is in the line with a number of recommendations received from good, sound labor organizations.

Then in regard to some recommendations, we have gone further than the recommendations themselves, particularly, in connection with funerals. The recommendation in the report recommended $200 for a burial, and $100 for the beneficiary. We have gone farther than the recommendation and propose to give the beneficiaries $200, which is not tied up with anything. We do not put a restriction upon what the funeral director charges. I think we have given the widows and the children a "break" there. In both of these things have we gone farther than the report recommends. I am not sure about the $4,000. I think it was in the report.

There are some other minor details. There are, of course, some things outstanding. We have altered the Judge's recommendations and have gone farther in regard to two of them, and I think the hon. members will agree that it is good business to wait and see, and to make sure. If we have gone farther in two out of three, goodness knows what we may do in regard to the others some of these days. We are looking at this in the light of what labor and other people are saying.

So I think my hon. friends opposite would be glad to approve the principle of this Bill, and pass it on to Committee. I will assure the House again that it is not our intention to hasten the matter, but to

wait until we receive further representations from some very active groups.

Now, I come to the---

MR. JOLLIFFE: Just for a moment, Mr. Speaker; will the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) not say a word on the question of accident prevention?

MR. FROST: I think that is one of the most highly important things. On the other hand, I agree with the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley). In Ontario we have already developed an accident prevention to a very high degree.

(Pag F-8 follows)

I do not, for a moment, say that this is as far advanced as it should be, but I think he has been wise in waiting before he rushes into something, and to make positively sure.

The fact that this Report has emphasized accident prevention, shows both to employers of labour and to the workmen the importance of it. I would not say for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that what the Judge has recommended is the last word. I do not think there is anything more important than accident prevention and rehabilitation. It is the most important feature, and I would not want to discount anything that the Judge has said.

In connection with this amendment moved by the hon. Member for St. Andrew(Mr. Salsberg); I think it is clearly out of order. I have referred it to the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter), and hiw words to me were that it was "involved, ingenious and devious". I quite agree with what he said, and probably there are one or two other words he would like to add.

I will just read this .

Mr. Justice Roach has said this in his Report:

"I recommend that Section 33 be deleted from the Act, and that in its stead a provision be inserted as the result of which, from the date upon which such a provision shall become operative, the additional moniew necessary to provide for any increase in compensation in respect to accidents which occurred prior to the increase authorized by the Act, shall be paid by the Government to the Board out

of the consolidated revenue fund."

But this Resolution says, "And the said Bill shall be referred forthwith to the Select Committee on Labour and that the said Committee be authorized to incorporate in the Bill provisions implementing the recommendations of the hon. Mr. Justice Roach regarding accident prevention, industrial diseases, compensation for second injury and injuries aggravated by pre-existing physical condition, and such other recommendations of the said Mr. Justice Roach as the Committee deems advisable."

In other words, by this Resolution, we are asked to give to this Select Committee a blank cheque to amend this Bill to include payments by the Government out of the consolidated revenue fund.

I do not know who wrote this Resolution, but I assume it was written by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) who is a Bay Street lawyer - and is really a good one, one of those lawyers who has graduated from the class of the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) -

MR. JOLLIFFE; Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege; a Richmond Street lawyer. Let us be accurate. Let us not have these Conservative inaccuracies.

MR. FROST: All right. I will withdraw "Bay Street". I will accept the word of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). I thought he was a Bay Street lawyer, who wants to buy a farm, and any Bay Street lawyer who buys a farm and gets cattle and horses, is really getting to be important lawyers. I am looking forward to the day when the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) will reach that stage.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) says he is from Richmond street, which puts him about next door to Lindsay.

Mr Speaker, I think this amendment is clearly out of order, and I think that can be substantiated by reference to page 57 of Lewis' famoux Book: "Parliamentary Procedure in Ontario", at page 57, where we find:

> "If a Member approves the principle of the Bill he should support it and postpone the discussion of any section which he desires to criticize until the Bill is under consideration 'clause by clause' in Committee of the Whole.
>
> "No amendment can be offered to the Motion for the Second Reading of the Bill which would have the effect of altering the question which the Bill proposes,"

and so forth.

I am relying on the fact that this is clearly out of order, and is, in fact, giving a blank cheque to a Committee of this House to insert provisions in this Bill relating to the expenditure of public money.

I say to the hon. members opposite that I recognize their difficulties in criticising this Bill because, after all, this Bill is another advance anongst a great many, which the people of Ontario over a period of 35 years have a great deal of reason to be proud, and I think the fact that some of these matters are -

not thrown out - but postponed for consideration, is good, and in fact, the Government is proceeding along this line where there is a difference of opinion in this House.

(TAKE "G" FOLLOWS)

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we should proceed on these lines.

MR. FELL: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) a question, please?

Do I understand from the words propounded by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that there is absolutely no intention in the part of the Government to allow this Report, or this Bill, to go before the Standing Committee of this House? Is that the intent?

MR. FROST: I did not say that to my hon. friend (Mr. Fell). What I said to my hon. friend was this, and I did not want to be devious or ingenious or involved in--

MR. FELL: You see, I am not a lawyer at all, you have to tell me.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: When my hon. friend (Mr. Fell) recommends that this matter should be referred to the Committee of the House, with all these things tied on it, I say that it is out of order. Now, I always like to keep an open mind on other matters.

MR. FELL: Then may I ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) if we cannot simply take this before the Standing Committee on Labor? Will the government still object to that or will you permit it to go that far?

MR. FROST: Oh, "sufficient unto the day --".

MR. FELL: Will this government convene the Standing Labor Committee of this House to deal with these problems, regardless to what extent they --

MR. FROST: That is not what my hon. friend (Mr. Fell) said, though.

MR. FELL: Well, --

MR. SPEAKER: I think that question is out of

order right now because we are discussing a particular Bill and not the Labor Committee. If the hon. member (Mr. Fell) likes to raise the question as regards the convening of that Committee at some other time when we are discussing the committee, well and good, but I cannot accept it now when discussing this Bill.

I take it the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) wishes a ruling on this amendment?

MR. FROST: Yes, please.

MR. SPEAKER: In view of the report given by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and the reading of the clause from Mr. Justice Roach's report, I would have to rule the amendment out of order, under Rule 112 of Lewis:

"By the 54th section of the Imperial Act,--" so and so, "it is provided that the House shall not adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended by a message of the Lieutenant-Governor in the Session in which such vote, resolution, address or Bill is proposed."

In view of the fact that the amendment does call for the expenditure of monies which have not been recommended, I must rule it out of order.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, may I move, seconded by Mr. MacLeod,

"that Bill number 66 be not now read a second time but that it be referred to the Standing Committee on Labor for consideration and review".

It is simple, and quite to the point.

MR. SPEAKER: I would rule that this is the same

kind of amendment, only in different words --

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, no.

MR. SPEAKER: -- in that the Bill, which is a money Bill, be referred to this particular Committee, which is a Committee of the House dealing with funds which have not yet been mentioned. I think the same rule, Rule 112, would apply to this.

MR. FROST: Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it is out of order because the other resolution said that the Bill be forthwith referred to the Committee on Labor.

MR. A.A. MACLEOD: (Bellwoods): Oh, no.

MR. SALSBERG: Use the English letters.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I must say that the lawyers are not arguing very well today. I am not of course inferring that you are a lawyer, but I do in all deference to you, sir, suggest that the motion, the amendment moved by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) is in an entirely different category from the amendment moved by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Fell), and I suggest that it is well within the Rules of the House and that nothing in the set of rules which guide our deliberations can be cited as an authority for declaring the motion out of order.

I would therefore suggest to you, with respect, that you defer your ruling on it and not just rule it out of order without citing the authority on which your ruling is based.

MR. H.C. NIXON (Brant): May I ask, Mr. Speaker -- this will not bring the debate of the Bill to an end, will it?

MR. SPEAKER: No. This is just on the amendment.

I am only ruling on the amendment, and then the Bill is open for debate, of course, when that is cleared away.

This raises a question. As I understand it, the ruling was made on the whole Bill as in the original amendment, should be referred to the Labor Committee with these various provisos. Now then, my reason for so repeating the ruling is that the full intent, it seems to me, is that the Bill be referred to the Labor Committee with these provisos but not --

MR. SALSBERG: Not at all, Mr. Speaker. May I suggest to you, with the utmost of respect, that you can only act on the basis of what is actually written in that amendment.

MR. MACLEOD: That is not implied.

MR. SALSBERG: And there is no implication, even, that the Committee is instructed to do one thing or another. All it asks, and it asks it in a very simple, ordinary fashion, is that Bill be not now read a second time but that it be referred to the Standing Committee for its consideration and review. No instructions whatsoever.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to waste the time of the House. As far as we are concerned, we are quite satisfied that the vote should be on this, if there is a matter of embarrassment in ruling on this, and personally I never like to see bad law made at any time, whether it may be at the instance of the opposition or anybody else.

I do not want to see this go to the Labor Committee for this reason: we want to see these great benefits come to our people as soon as we can, and I

would say this, that you only obscure this with doubt and everything by holding back these benefits.

MR. SALSBERG: But your Bill says it shall not come into force until 1952.

MR. FROST: Now, just a minute. We on this side believe we should get this thing through. After all, all hon. members of the House are interested, the matter will come up in committee at that time and other matters can be considered. Let us get a job done for the people and put this Bill through. I think there is not a sentence in this Bill that anyone in this province would disagree with, they would all think it was to the point, and I think they would feel we should get this Bill through.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw anything that may have been said about the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) putting forward this motion; I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if you rule or if you allow a vote on it, we are quite satisfied. I should urge my hon. friend the member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) to withdraw this, to have obstructionist matters like this withdrawn from the way of this Bill, and let the matter go through. However, if he wants to do this, which we think obstructs this, we will ---

MR. JOLLIFFE: Again let me just say this to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), and to the House. In time gone by we have often had Bills here moved for second reading by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy).

MR.MACLEOD: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And in his off-hand way he has

said more than once: "I think this ought to go to Committee on Agriculture" or he would say :"If anyone may like to have this discussed, it could go into the Committee on Agriculture, and I am quite agreeable".

MR. MACLEOD: That is right.

MR. FROST: I would say that is quite true, but the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) perhaps was uncertain in his own mind and wanted to change some of these things. There is not a line in this thing we intend to change. This is all good law.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Just a moment. Every hon. member of this House knows that if the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) were not so unsure about this Bill that he would be just as happy to have it go to the Labor Committee as the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) was to have his Bill go to Committee on so many occasions in the past.

MR. DALEY: Oh, I am sure about it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is the difficulty here, if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) wishes a vote to be taken on the matter, which we were going to suggest in any event either in this stage or later, that is the issue, whether the Bill should be considered by the Labor Committee. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) was good enough to withdraw his objection on the point of order and permit a vote to be taken on the real issue, then I think that is all to the good, but I am disappointed that the government should on this occasion run away from consideration in the Labor Committee.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to my hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost)?

MR. FROST: Depends on the question.

MR. MACLEOD: Naturally, the government -- no government, I suppose, wants to be placed in the position of having its motions amended, because when an amendment of this character is introduced it looks as though an attempt is being made to reverse government policy.

And now may I ask this question, bearing in mind the precedent cited by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe): if the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) were to withdraw his amendment, and having regard to the fact that you told us a little while ago that you are not going to rush this Bill through committee, that you are going to wait until you have received representation from the two Congresses etc.; in view of that fact, would the hon Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) be prepared on his own to call the Labor Committee and let the Labor Committee discuss, among other matters, this legislation which is being discussed here this afternoon? I mean, what else could the Standing Committee, Labor, do that would be a more appropriate discharge of its functions than to discuss a piece of legislation of this character?

I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is being a little unfair when he brands an amendment of this sort as a piece of calculated obstruction. It is nothing of the sort.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) knows it, too.

MR. MACLEOD: We have over a period of years -- not only we, but the official opposition -- have urged the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) to convene this sadly neglected committee, and he has refused to do so, for some unknown reason. Well, I think that we have this year a number of pieces of legislation that might very properly and very appropriately engage the attention of that committee.

MR. SALSBERG: Let us start with this one.

MR. MACLEOD: If in view of the fact this is going to stand for a little while, I see no reason why the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) or the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) should not tell us that the Labor Committee will meet, and among other things, will have an opportunity to discuss the provisions of this Bill in the light of the report of Mr. Justice Roach.

I think that is reasonable.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend (Mr. MacLeod) is very devious too, in his argument.

MR. MACLEOD: Oh, no, I am never devious -- never devious.

MR. FROST: Let me point this out to you. Here is a Bill before this House; my hon. friend (Mr. MacLeod) does not want to vote against the Bill or a line that is in the Bill. He agrees with everything that is in it. Now, I think he would certainly agree with it, and I think my hon. friends opposite would agree with it; what is the use of sending to a committee a Bill that everybody agrees to in its entirety? There is nothing to

this thing. I think that hon. members of this House say that every one of these provisions are good. Why send it to a committee?

MR. G.E. PARK (Dovercourt): Add more to it.

MR. FROST: Not to discuss the provisions of the Bill, but to bring in other matters which may be extraneous. After all, the government must take responsibility for governing. Here is a matter of policy, here is the policy set out in the Bill. My hon. friends opposite have not said a word against anything in the Bill. They say :"We would like this in, or we would like something else in". I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that is the place for a committee to consider matters. I quite acknowledge oftentimes that there may be some technical matter relating to the length of black bass that you could take, and the days you can take it, and there may be doubts, there may be a difference of opinion and the minister may say to the Committee of the House: "Now, what do you think about it?", and then there is an impartial consideration of the matter and they decide upon a certain thing and that is brought in here and is adopted into law.

May I say to my hon. friend (Mr. MacLeod), we have not any intention of doing that. There is not a section of this Bill they are concerned with, they would pass everything and say :" Now, that is pretty fine, generous legislation". Not one of them has said anything about anything that is in the Bill, this is what is not in the Bill.

(TAKE "H" FOLLOWS)

That is not a matter for a Committee. We are not asking the advice of the House, nor are we providing a sounding-board to have matters go to a Committee, to create a doubt in the minds of our people. After all, our position is that we asked the hon. Mr. Justice Roach to report on The Workmen's Compensation Act. At no time was it intimated to him that everything he recommended would be adopted, but what we have done is this: We have found his report in the main highly acceptable and we take the first opportunity of implementing those things which we think are beyond any controversy and which are sound and proper. As I say, we are implementing them. I am saying ---and I know the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) agrees with me in this---there are some of these other matters which we are not saying will not be implemented; they will be implemented in the fullness of time.

AN hon. MEMBER: A long time.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Our methods of implementing them, and the time we take, is not very long, either; we will implement them and we will give to the people of this province government which we think is sound and sure, and of which we think they will approve.

Now, those are the reasons which I think apply. When my hon. friend says he is never devious, of course he is devious in that respect. He wants to bring this up in the Committee for the purposes of creating trouble and embarrassment and making it appear that this government is holding back. That is not the case at all; we are in

the forefront in reform and that is the way we want to be.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Would the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) answer this question? He has intimated here, today, that this Bill---No. 66, I believe--- is not going to be rushed and there are representations to be made. It seems to me, and I would like to ask if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) does not agree it is a bit discourteous to have a standing committee on labor of this House while this House is in Session. Representations by labor bodies and others, will be made concerning the subject matter of this Bill. The Bill is going to be delayed until those representations are heard. It is a bit discourteous, I say, and my suggestion is, and I ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to agree that while we have a Standing Committee of members elected by the people of the province to deal with labor questions, the Bill is going to be delayed by the government in order to hear representations. Why should the Labor Committee of this House not hear those representations and be able to discuss them with the people making the representations? And I ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) if he does not agree it is a bit extraordinary and to some extent discourteous that the Standing Committee which has been elected by this Legislature on Labour should not meet and hear these representations the same as the government might hear them.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Oh, no, Mr. Speaker; after all, a government should not and I do not

think my hon. friends of the Opposition would have much respect for the government which delegated and kept delegating its powers to others. After all, it is our business to---

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Powers?

MR. FROST: Well, I mean the matter of policy is a matter for the government. As far as the representations made by others are concerned, first, all of the hon. members of this Committee are members of this House. You are all interested in this highly important matter. There is no necessity for the government to make up its mind;we have the opportunity of proceeding at the first opportunity with this very important measure and we say to you, frankly, that it is not the end of this report, by any means. There are other matters in which we are very greatly interested.

Now, as regards hearing representations, I would say to my hon. friend from York West (Mr. Millard) that we have always adopted the policy of listening to people. We have deputations, many deputations, with respect to many Bills and we listen to the representations which are made. Frankly, we even have deputations, labour deputations, who come to us and say "Now, gentlemen, we would like to see you do so-and-so, but if you cannot do that, go this far, and we would certainly be satisfied." We often have deputations speak to us in words along those lines. We have already had deputations in connection with parts of this Bill and we have listened to what they have to say,

and our purpose for not hurrying this for the matter of a few days is the fact that some of the organizations feel that, having seen the wording of the Act, perhaps there would be something they would like to have changed, and we feel disposed to do that.

I should think this should be given second reading. When the matter comes up in Committee there will, no doubt, be other matters considered at that time. There cannot be, I should imagine, from my hon. friends opposite, any opposition to this Bill, the provisions of this Bill.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, are we talking about the policy or about the Bill?

I would like to say just a few words in connection with the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment would have to be disposed of.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): One more word on the amendment, Mr. Speaker, before you finally dispose of it. I am not speaking for the mover of the motion. I would like, however, through you, Mr. Speaker, to address this question to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

Just suppose, for the sake of argument, that the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) should withdraw his amendment and that the vote on second reading take place, would the government be prepared to give an undertaking that, after the Bill has received second reading---which, after all, is a matter of principle, that vote is going to be taken some time and I imagine it is possible to assume

what the result would be---but let us assume that it has second reading today, would the government be prepared then, after it has received second reading, to have it go to the Labour Committee without discussion of its clauses, some of which might be amended when it reaches the Committee stage in the House?

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I never make it a point of answering hypothetical questions, particularly when they are propounded by the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod).

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): I am speaking for the Bill now? Is that all right?

MR. SPEAKER: It is going to get very complicated here.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, if you should rule that the amendment is in order, then, of course, the debate would proceed.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): He has withdrawn his objection.

MR. MacLEOD: Yes. So, the amendment is not in order.

MR. J. G. WHITE (Kenora): Does the amendment call for consideration and review?

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment calls for consideration and review.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): I would like to say a word about the amendment.

We have spoken a great deal in this House from time

to time with respect to the failure of the Labor Committee to meet. Now, I have only been in this House for three Sessions, and I, personally, would like to find out whether this Labor Committee is the monster or monstrosity that it is reputed as being, and, being such, therefore I would like to personally see this matter referred to the Committee and let this be an experiment and see how it does work out.

MR. C. C. CALDER (London): I most heartily associate myself with the hon. member from Waterloo North (Mr. Brown). What we want to see this House do---he and I, personally---is that we do what you did in the matter of the Public Accounts Committee. Apparently some bogey has attached itself to this word "labor" just as there used to be attached to Public Accounts. When my hon. friend called for Public Accounts the government shrank back until you were persuaded that we meant business and nothing business and we honestly tried to advance something which you, I think, admit now did something good.

I plead with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) not to brush this off because you brush us off, and we want to make our contribution. The Hon. Mr. Justice Roach has made his, and the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) has made his and there is no intention, apart from a few sparks which are bound to fly up in any busy work shop, of embarrassing the government.

I would be perfectly happy to see this understood amongst all of us that in this experimental meeting of the

Committee we discuss Bill No. 66 and nothing but Bill No. 66.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CALDER: And after we have that under our belts let us proceed calmly to meet again and plead with the honl Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to do this thing.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Yes--

MR. SPEAKER: Moved Mr. J. B. Salsberg, seconded by Mr. A. A. MacLeod, that Bill No. 66 be not read the second time but that it be referred to the Standing Committee on Labor for consideration and review.

Amendment negatived.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Let us get a division.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment is lost.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker--

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): The hon. member from Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) is out of order.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): I would like, first of all, to compliment the government upon bringing in the amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act.

SOMEhon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BROWN: I sincerely trust, however, that the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) will give credit where credit is due and commend this group over here for the part which it has played on two previous occasions in

bringing in practically the same types of Bills as has finally been presented to us in this Bill, today. I have reference to the sections with respect to waiting period. And also to the maximum allowance. These sections have been presented here and, while one is a little less than we had asked for, the other one is slightly more. Personally, I am very much in favor of the increase to $4,000 maximum allowance because if $2,000 was the proper figure back in 1915 when the Bill was first drafted by Chief Justice Middleton, it seems reasonable to believe that $4,000 is the right figure now.

(Take I follows)

Therefore, I am very much in favour of the Bill as presented. It does seem to me there is some merit in the arguments which have been presented with respect to items which have not been contained in the Bill, and I have particular reference to one which is made by the hon. Member for Parkdale (Mr. Fell) in which he dealt with the old cases, which I think should now be considered, those who come under the 50% and the 66 2/3%, because out of every five Workmen's Compensation cases which are presented to me, four of them are from men who come under this handicap. It does seem to me that the Government might have used a little bit of their own imagination, and not just dealt with the recommendations contained in the Coach Report, and brought forward itself some recommendations are amendments to the Act in this regard.

MR. FROST: There are two cases where we have altered the recommendation, the "waiting period", and "Fuheral Expenses".

MR. BROWN: I am talking about the people who still get the same Wormen's Compensation. They were getting 55%. I am not talking about the percentages, but the wages which were not affected by this Compensation. In other words, the percentagewas not changed, and it seems to me as though the floor should be raised substantially, in order to give these people a higher return in Workmen's Compensation.

I think the Government in its wisdom, at the last Session or the Session before, did exactly the same thing with respect to school teachers who were not receiving sufficient superannuation, and I believe some consideration was given to that. It seems to me we should do exactly the same thing in this regard.

I was very pleased to get the assurance of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) with respect to those afflicted with industrial diseases, because there, too, I have had representations made to me by men who claim that they could not get the Workmen's Compensation, but who feel they are entitled to it, because they developed their diseases within their own plants.

As I say, I was very pleased to get the assurance of the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) that all of those will be covered, I sincerely hope that is the case.

I would like to say one word with respect to accident prevention now, irrespective of whether the Government, at this Session or very soon, does consider that portion of the Report with regard to accident prevention. I do feel sincerely there should be some provision made, either in this Act or in another Act, perhaps called "The Accident Prevention Act" -- whereby a Committee will be set up at the local factory level, to make it mandatory. I will concede that we have a great many of these Committees set up, and they are doing excellent jobs, and it seems to me it should be compulsory for every plant which has a total enrollment of twenty or more.

There are a great many of these Committees now set up, and as I say, they are doing an excellent job, and they are representatives for the most part. I know of cases where 100% of the Committee is composed of labour, with the exception, possibly, of the Chairman. They rotate every six months, and appointments are made from those who have had a bad experience in accidents, in order that they might become safety conscious.

It seems to me the Government would be well advised to introduce a Bill of its own to take care of this feature of accident prevention.

Again I want to commend the Government for bringing in the Bill as it is now drafted, and I sincerely trust in due course they will add to it and recommend the matters suggested by ourselves.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, perhaps even at this moment the Government is beginning to wish it had seen the wisdom of my suggestion, and we should have been spared this talk.

MR. FROST: Is the hon. Member (Mr. Calder) going to talk the Bill out?

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Are you for it or against it?

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. CALDER: I am for the Bill -

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CALDER: But I am still not satisfied. The great difficulty about this Bill is its omissions.

As I understand the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) it is the intention of the government to press down the waiting period just as low as possible, and as the office facilities permit. We have it down to five days now, and we are going to go along with you, or get behind you, or get ahead of you, until with better business methods you can cut it down to four days, and then to three.

From my experience, the bottleneck is in the plant and machinery, and if that is the bottleneck, then I urge the government to lay on the lash. We are dealing with workmen's compensation and with people who very often do not have bank accounts, only debts, and when these accidents occur, hon. members do not need very much persuasion; their own experience tells them. To my mind what is most pressing is the accumulation of misery which comes within the immediate 24 hours following. The landlady is at the door; the grocer will not extend credit beyond Saturday night, and while it seems a simple thing, it is the kind of thing which means a great deal to the men for whom this Act is intended.

I do not claim to have had a great deal of experience. You do not get many compensation cases amongst lawyers, but this House has to direct its minds toward the people for whom we profess to act, and the question of disability, is really a matter of urgency.

That brings up another question. The hon.

Minister (Mr. Daley) indicated that, after all, it is the administration of the Act which really counts, not perhaps so much the legislation. Within limits, one can agree, but the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) must remember that the Board cannot go beyond the letter of the law. It is for us, and nobody but us---although I think the Labor Committee could do it better---to decide how far the legislation shall go.

In one section you say the Board shall have the power to penalize medical men who are tardy in submitting their accounts. I can understand that in former years the Board was struggling with busy doctors trying to see that they were not tardy in sending in their accounts. To me that seems important, because I know of cases where after correspondence was had ., it finally developed that there has been no medical report received as yet. I am sure other hon. members have had the same experience.

It is a very difficult problem to administer. The Board knows it; the doctors know it; the disabled workmen appreciate it, and what he cannot get over is the fact that until the medical report goes in, he does not get his compensation cheque. That is another thing not provided for in the Bill. The Board must struggle with it, and it is a real problem, one of significant importance, about which the Board can do something, perhaps not by legislation, but in some other way, and it is a standing problem which must be met.

Another complaint which the hon. members get in compensation cases is the disabled workmen writes to the Board, and only comes to us after he gets no reply from the government. Again that is a matter of administration, but not touched upon in this Bill. I would suggest to the government that somewhere they work out something, even if it is only in the nature of sending out form letters---impatient as we are all with form letters ---where the worker gets back by return mail an acknowledgment that his letter has been received, and is receiving attention. That may give no comfort to the workmen; they may read between the lines, and realize it is just a government communication, but, on the other thand, it may provide some genuine comfort.

Time and again it has been impressed upon me the fact of the silence upon the part of the Board, and what bothers the claimants is to find some means by which that silence can be overcome.

I quite realize the volume of cases which roll through that office, and I know what you are up against in administration, but this is a suggestion which can get you somewhere, a thing which needs to be done, and that is, to satisfy the disabled workmen and his friends in the shop, that everything is being done that can be done for him.

It is all very well for us in this House to share with the government some satisfaction in the reputation of the Workmen's Compensation Board, but whenever I look

at the front row---

MR. SPEAKER: May I interject? I wonder if the hon. member (Mr. Calder) could not discuss the principle of the Bill? I think we are getting into a lot of detailed work in this discussion. I feel we should discuss the general principle of the Bill, instead of committee matters. I think, from the discussion, this Bill deals with three or four specific matters, on the general question of compensation.

(Take J follows)

That is the way it appeared to me. I think we are going into details which undoubtedly could be brought up again when the Bill is in committee stage.

MR. CALDER: Mr. Speaker, your thoughtful observation to me permitted me to see that it is now six o'clock, and I would therefore move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend (Mr. Calder) wants to adjourn the debate, it will go on on Wednesday, which I personally do not want to do. I think we should get this business cleaned up. There is nothing to be gained by delaying tactics of that sort. I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Calder) to let this go by, and if he has a point of detail in connection with the details of this Bill he will have lots of opportunity to discuss it.

MR. NIXON: May I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that he should not use that term with regard the hon. member's (Mr. Calder) speech. My hon. friend (Mr. Frost) was calling it delaying tactics.

AN. hon. MEMBER: What else is it?

MR. NIXON: Your own hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) in introducing the Bill this afternoon went far farther afield.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: May I say if the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) had not rambled along so long, this trouble would not have arisen.

MR. FROST: This is actually all out of order. Every hon. member had the opportunity of discussing and

speaking on this Bill. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) and myself, in winding up the debate, were asked not to speak until certain hon. members had had the opportunity of speaking, and I thought myself when the vote was taken on the amendment that we were going to get on with business. I wonder if we could not clear up the debate on this and get ahead? We have a thick order paper.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Just to straighten that out, Mr. Speaker, may I say when I rose to speak I endeavoured to do so before the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) spoke again, because I thought perhaps he had in mind closing the debate, but I was not speaking for anybody else in that connection. I was not informed who wished to speak.

MR. FROST: I realize that. I thought myself----

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) did not tell me that he wanted to speak, but if he wants to speak on this Bill he has a perfect right to do so.

MR. FROST: Yes, of course.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And I do not think it is proper to say of any opposition member because he happened to start making a speech ten minutes ago that he is indulging in delaying tactics. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) complained earlier in the day about somebody imputing motives. I do not think it is proper for him now to impute motives to an hon. member who starts to make a speech at four o'clock or at six o'clock.

MR. FROST: I will be happy to withdraw any imputation of that kind if my hon. friend (Mr. Calder) will assist us to get through.

MR. CALDER: I will be happy, Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to stand up and say in the interval, to endeavour to shorten anything I have to say which is of some consequence, but, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I am not the last -- certainly I am by no means the most important -- person who may still have to speak on this Bill, and it is with that thought in mind that I do again move the adjournment of the debate.

The motion stands.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House, then, I will bring in a motion tomorrow to meet at two o'clock on Wednesday. We had intended to meet at three, but we will meet at two o'clock on Wednesday, and I will give my hon. friend (Mr. Calder) an hour to speak on the Bill, and I hope we will be able to go on with private members yet.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Now I think that is the first good idea the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has had today.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I am always trying to please you. I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.04 of the clock p.m.

- - - - - -